NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLXXIX.

JUNE, 1888.

COL. INGERSOLL TO MR. GLADSTONE.*

To

THE RIGHT HONORABLE W. E. GLADSTONE, M. P.:

MY DEAR SIR:

AT the threshold of this Reply, it gives me pleasure to say that for your intellect and character I have the greatest respect; and let me say further, that I shall consider your arguments, assertions, and inferences entirely apart from your personality—apart from the exalted position that you occupy in the estimation of the civilized world. I gladly acknowledge the inestimable services that you have rendered, not only to England, but to mankind. Most men are chilled and narrowed by the snows of age; their thoughts are darkened by the approach of night. But you, for many years, have hastened toward the light, and your mind has been "an autumn that grew the more by reaping."

Under no circumstances could I feel justified in taking advantage of the admissions that you have made as to the "errors," the "misfeasance," the "infirmities and the perversity" of the Christian church.

It is perfectly apparent that churches, being only aggregations of people, contain the prejudice, the ignorance, the vices and the virtues of ordinary human beings. The perfect cannot be made out of the imperfect.

A man is not necessarily a great mathematician because he admits the correctness of the multiplication table. The best creed

* This article is copyrighted, and all rights are reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be believed by the worst of the human race. Neither the crimes nor the virtues of the church tend to prove or disprove the supernatural origin of religion. The massacre of St. Bartholomew tends no more to establish the inspiration of the scriptures, than the bombardment of Alexandria.

But there is one thing that cannot be admitted, and that is your statement that the constitution of man is in a "warped, impaired, and dislocated condition," and that "these deformities indispose men to belief." Let us examine this.

We say that a thing is "warped" that was once nearer level, flat, or straight; that it is "impaired" when it was once nearer perfect, and that it is "dislocated" when once it was united. Consequently, you have said that at some time the human constitution was unwarped, unimpaired, and with each part working in harmony with all. You seem to believe in the degeneracy of man, and that our unfortunate race, starting at perfection, has traveled downward through all the wasted years.

It is hardly possible that our ancestors were perfect. If history proves anything, it establishes the fact that civilization was not first, and savagery afterwards. Certainly the tendency of man is not now toward barbarism. There must have been a time when language was unknown, when lips had never formed a word. That which man knows, man must have learned. The victories of our race have been slowly and painfully won. It is a long distance from the gibberish of the savage to the sonnets of Shakespeare—a long and weary road from the pipe of Pan to the great orchestra voiced with every tone from the glad warble of a mated bird to the hoarse thunder of the sea. The road is long that lies between the discordant cries uttered by the barbarian over the gashed body of his foe and the marvelous music of Wagner and Beethoven. It is hardly possible to conceive of the years that lie between the caves in which crouched our naked ancestors crunching the bones of wild beasts, and the home of a civilized man with its comforts, its articles of luxury and use,—with its works of art, with its enriched and illuminated walls. Think of the billowed years that must have rolled between these shores. Think of the vast distance that man has slowly groped from the dark dens and lairs of ignorance and fear to the intellectual conquests of our day.

Is it true that these deformities, these "warped, impaired, and dislocated constitutions indispose men to belief"? Can we in this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way account for the doubts entertained by the intellectual leaders of mankind ?

It will not do, in this age and time, to account for unbelief in this deformed and dislocated way. The exact opposite must be true. Ignorance and credulity sustain the relation of cause and effect. Ignorance is satisfied with assertion, with appearance. As man rises in the scale of intelligence he demands evidence. He begins to look back of appearance. He asks the priest for reasons. The most ignorant part of Christendom is the most orthodox.

You have simply repeated a favorite assertion of the clergy, to the effect that man rejects the gospel because he is naturally depraved and hard of heart—because, owing to the sin of Adam and Eve, he has fallen from the perfection and purity of paradise to that "impaired" condition in which he is satisfied with the filthy rags of reason, observation and experience.

The truth is, that what you call unbelief is only a higher and holier faith. Millions of men reject Christianity because of its cruelty. The Bible was never rejected by the cruel. It has been upheld by countless tyrants—by the dealers in human flesh—by the destroyers of nations—by the enemies of intelligence—by the stealers of babes and the whippers of women.

It is also true that it has been held as sacred by the good, the self-denying, the virtuous and the loving, who clung to the sacred volume on account of the good it contains and in spite of all its cruelties and crimes.

You are mistaken when you say that all "the faults of all the Christian bodies and subdivisions of bodies have been carefully raked together," in my Reply to Dr. Field, "and made part and parcel of the indictment against the divine scheme of salvation."

No thoughtful man pretends that any fault of any Christian body can be used as an argument against what you call the "divine scheme of redemption."

I find in your Remarks the frequent charge that I am guilty of making assertions and leaving them to stand without the assistance of argument or fact, and it may be proper, at this particular point, to inquire how you know that there is "a divine scheme of redemption."

My objections to this "divine scheme of redemption" are: *first*, that there is not the slightest evidence that it is divine; *sec-*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ond, that it is not in any sense a "scheme," human or divine; and *third,* that it cannot, by any possibility, result in the redemption of a human being.

It cannot be divine, because it has no foundation in the nature of things, and is not in accordance with reason. It is based on the idea that right and wrong are the expression of an arbitrary will, and not words applied to and descriptive of acts in the light of consequences. It rests upon the absurdity called "pardon," upon the assumption that when a crime has been committed justice will be satisfied with the punishment of the innocent. One person may suffer, or reap a benefit, in consequence of the act of another, but no man can be justly punished for the crime, or justly rewarded for the virtues, of another. A "scheme" that punishes an innocent man for the vices of another can hardly be called divine. Can a murderer find justification in the agonies of his victim? There is no vicarious vice; there is no vicarious virtue. For me it is hard to understand how a just and loving being can charge one of his children with the vices, or credit him with the virtues, of another.

And why should we call anything a "divine scheme" that has been a failure from the "fall of man" until the present moment? What race, what nation, has been redeemed through the instrumentality of this "divine scheme"? Have not the subjects of redemption been for the most part the enemies of civilization? Has not almost every valuable book since the invention of printing been denounced by the believers in the "divine scheme"? Intelligence, the development of the mind, the discoveries of science, the inventions of genius, the cultivation of the imagination through art and music, and the practice of virtue will redeem the human race. These are the saviors of mankind.

You admit that the "Christian churches have by their exaggerations and shortcomings, and by their faults of conduct, contributed to bring about a condition of hostility to religious faith."

If one wishes to know the worst that man has done, all that power guided by cruelty can do, all the excuses that can be framed for the commission of every crime, the infinite difference that can exist between that which is professed and that which is practiced, the marvelous malignity of meekness, the arrogance of humility and the savagery of what is known as "universal love," let him read the history of the Christian church.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet, I not only admit that millions of Christians have been honest in the expression of their opinions, but that they have been among the best and noblest of our race.

And it is further admitted that a creed should be examined apart from the conduct of those who have assented to its truth. The church should be judged as a whole, and its faults should be accounted for either by the weakness of human nature, or by reason of some defect or vice in the religion taught,—or by both.

Is there anything in the Christian religion—anything in what you are pleased to call the "Sacred Scriptures," tending to cause the crimes and atrocities that have been committed by the Church?

It seems to be natural for man to defend himself and the ones he loves. The father slays the man who would kill his child —he defends the body. The Christian father burns the heretic —he defends the soul.

If "orthodox Christianity" be true, an infidel has not the right to live. Every book in which the bible is attacked should be burned with its author. Why hesitate to burn a man whose constitution is "warped, impaired and dislocated," for a few moments, when hundreds of others will be saved from eternal flames?

In Christianity you will find the cause of persecution. The idea that belief is essential to salvation—this ignorant and merciless dogma—accounts for the atrocities of the church. This absurd declaration built the dungeons, used the instruments of torture, erected the scaffolds and lighted the fagots of a thousand years.

What, I pray you, is the "heavenly treasure" in the keeping of your church? Is it a belief in an infinite God? That was believed thousands of years before the serpent tempted Eve. Is it the belief in the immortality of the soul? That is far older. Is it that man should treat his neighbor as himself? That is more ancient. What is the treasure in the keeping of the church? Let me tell you. It is this: That there is but one true religion —Christianity,—and that all others are false; that the prophets, and Christs, and priests of all others have been and are impostors, or the victims of insanity; that the bible is the one inspired book —the one authentic record of the words of God; that all men are naturally depraved and deserve to be punished with unspeakable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

torments forever; that there is only one path that leads to heaven, while countless highways lead to hell; that there is only one name under heaven by which a human being can be saved; that we must believe in the Lord Jesus Christ; that this life, with its few and fleeting years, fixes the fate of man; that the few will be saved and the many forever lost. This is "the heavenly treasure" within the keeping of your church.

And this "treasure" has been guarded by the cherubim of persecution, whose flaming swords were wet for many centuries with the best and bravest blood. It has been guarded by cunning, by hypocrisy, by mendacity, by honesty, by calumniating the generous, by maligning the good, by thumbscrews and racks, by charity and love, by robbery and assassination, by poison and fire, by the virtues of the ignorant and the vices of the learned, by the violence of mobs and the whirlwinds of war, by every hope and every fear, by every cruelty and every crime, and by all there is of the wild beast in the heart of man.

With great propriety it may be asked: In the keeping of which church is this "heavenly treasure"? Did the Catholics have it, and was it taken by Luther? Did Henry the VIII. seize it, and is it now in the keeping of the Church of England? Which of the warring sects in America has this treasure; or have we, in this country, only the "rust and canker"? Is it in an Episcopal Church, that refuses to associate with a colored man for whom Christ died, and who is good enough for the society of the angelic host?

But wherever this "heavenly treasure" has been, about it have always hovered the Stymphalian birds of superstition, thrusting their brazen beaks and claws deep into the flesh of honest men.

You were pleased to point out as the particular line justifying your assertion "that denunciation, sarcasm, and invective constitute the staple of my work," that line in which I speak of those who expect to receive as alms an eternity of joy, and add: "I take this as a specimen of the mode of statement which permeates the whole."

Dr. Field commenced his Open Letter by saying: "I am glad that I know you, *even though some of my brethren look upon you as a monster, because of your unbelief.*"

In reply I simply said: "The statement in your Letter that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some of your brethren look upon me as a monster on account of my unbelief tends to show that those who love God are not always the friends of their fellow men. Is it not strange that people who admit that they ought to be eternally damned—that they are by nature depraved—that there is no soundness or health in them, can be so arrogantly egotistic as to look upon others as monsters? And yet some of your brethren, who regard unbelievers as infamous, rely for salvation entirely on the goodness of another, and expect to receive as alms an eternity of joy." Is there any denunciation, sarcasm, or invective in this?

Why should one who admits that he himself is totally depraved call any other man, by way of reproach, a monster? Possibly, he might be justified in addressing him as a fellow-monster.

I am not satisfied with your statement that "the Christian receives as alms all whatsoever he receives at all." Is it true that man deserves only punishment? Does the man who makes the world better, who works and battles for the right, and dies for the good of his fellow men, deserve nothing but pain and anguish? Is happiness a gift or a consequence? Is heaven only a well-conducted poorhouse? Are the angels in their highest estate nothing but happy paupers? Must all the redeemed feel that they are in heaven simply because there was a miscarriage of justice? Will the lost be the only ones who will know that the right thing has been done, and will they alone appreciate the "ethical elements of religion"? Will they repeat the words that you have quoted: "Mercy and judgment are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other"? or will those words be spoken by the redeemed as they joyously contemplate the writhings of the lost?

No one will dispute "that in the discussion of important questions calmness and sobriety are essential." But solemnity need not be carried to the verge of mental paralysis. In the search for truth,—that everything in nature seems to hide,—man needs the assistance of all his faculties. All the senses should be awake. Humor should carry a torch, Wit should give its sudden light, Candor should hold the scales, Reason, the final arbiter, should put his royal stamp on every fact, and Memory, with a miser's care, should keep and guard the mental gold.

The church has always despised the man of humor, hated laughter, and encouraged the lethargy of solemnity. It is not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

willing that the mind should subject its creed to every test of truth. It wishes to overawe. It does not say, "He that hath a mind to think let him think"; but, "He that hath ears to hear let him hear." The church has always abhorred wit,—that is to say, it does not enjoy being struck by the lightning of the soul. The foundation of wit is logic, and it has always been the enemy of the supernatural, the solemn and absurd.

You express great regret that no one at the present day is able to write like Pascal. You admire his wit and tenderness, and the unique, brilliant, and fascinating manner in which he treated the profoundest and most complex themes. Sharing in your admiration and regret, I call your attention to what might be called one of his religious generalizations: "Disease is the natural state of a Christian." Certainly it cannot be said that I have ever mingled the profound and complex in a more fascinating manner.

Another instance is given of the "tumultuous method in which I conduct, not, indeed, my argument, but my case."

Dr. Field had drawn a distinction between superstition and religion, to which I replied: "You are shocked at the Hindoo mother when she gives her child to death at the supposed command of her God. What do you think of Abraham, of Jephthah? What is your opinion of Jehovah himself?"

These simple questions seem to have excited you to an unusual degree, and you ask in words of some severity: "Whether this is the tone in which controversies ought be carried on?" And you say that—"not only is the name of Jehovah encircled in the heart of every believer with the profoundest reverence and love, but that the Christian religion teaches, through the incarnation, a personal relation with God so lofty that it can only be approached in a deep, reverential calm." You admit that "a person who deems a given religion to be wicked, may be led onward by logical consistency to impugn in strong terms the character of the author and object of that religion," but you insist that such person is "bound by the laws of social morality and decency to consider well the terms and meaning of his indictment."

Was there any lack of "reverential calm" in my question? I gave no opinion, drew no indictment, but simply asked for the opinion of another. Was that a violation of the "laws of social morality and decency"?

It is not necessary for me to discuss this question with you.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been settled by Jehovah himself. You probably remember the account given in the eighteenth chapter of I. Kings, of a contest between the prophets of Baal and the prophets of Jehovah. There were four hundred and fifty prophets of the false God who endeavored to induce their deity to consume with fire from heaven the sacrifice upon his altar. According to the account, they were greatly in earnest. They certainly appeared to have some hope of success, but the fire did not descend.

' And it came to pass at noon, that Elijah mocked them and said 'Cry aloud, for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked.'"

Do you consider that the proper way to attack the God of another? Did not Elijah know that the name of Baal "was encircled in the heart of every believer with the profoundest reverence and love"? Did he "violate the laws of social morality and decency"?

But Jehovah and Elijah did not stop at this point. They were not satisfied with mocking the prophets of Baal, but they brought them down to the brook Kishon—four hundred and fifty of them—and there they murdered every one.

Does it appear to you that on that occasion, on the banks of the brook Kishon—"Mercy and judgment met together, and that righteousness and peace kissed each other"?

The question arises: Has every one who reads the Old Testament the right to express his thought as to the character of Jehovah? You will admit that as he reads his mind will receive some impression, and that when he finishes the "inspired volume" he will have some opinion as to the character of Jehovah. Has he the right to express that opinion? Is the bible a revelation from God to man? Is it a revelation to the man who reads it, or to the man who does not read it? If to the man who reads it, has he the right to give to others the revelation that God has given to him? If he comes to the conclusion at which you have arrived,—that Jehovah is God,—has he the right to express that opinion?

If he concludes, as I have done, that Jehovah is a myth, must he refrain from giving his honest thought? Christians do not hesitate to give their opinion of heretics, philosophers and infidels. They are not restrained by the "laws of social morality and decency." They have persecuted to the extent of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power, and their Jehovah pronounced upon unbelievers every curse capable of being expressed in the Hebrew dialect. At this moment, thousands of missionaries are attacking the gods of the heathen world, and heaping contempt on the religion of others.

But as you have seen proper to defend Jehovah, let us for a moment examine this deity of the ancient Jews.

There are several tests of character. It may be that all the virtues can be expressed in the word "kindness," and that nearly all the vices are gathered together in the word "cruelty."

Laughter is a test of character. When we know what a man laughs at, we know what he really is. Does he laugh at misfortune, at poverty, at honesty in rags, at industry without food, at the agonies of his fellow men? Does he laugh when he sees the convict clothed in the garments of shame—at the criminal on the scaffold? Does he rub his hands with glee over the embers of an enemy's home? Think of a man capable of laughing while looking at Marguerite in the prison cell with her dead babe by her side. What must be the real character of a God who laughs at the calamities of his children, mocks at their fears, their desolation, their distress and anguish? Would an infinitely loving God hold his ignorant children in derision? Would he pity, or mock? Save, or destroy? Educate, or exterminate? Would he lead them with gentle hands toward the light, or lie in wait for them like a wild beast? Think of the echoes of Jehovah's laughter in the rayless caverns of the eternal prison. Can a good man mock at the children of deformity? Will he deride the misshapen? Your Jehovah deformed some of his own children, and then held them up to scorn and hatred. These divine mistakes—these blunders of the infinite—were not allowed to enter the temple erected in honor of him who had dishonored them. Does a kind father mock his deformed child? What would you think of a mother who would deride and taunt her misshapen babe?

There is another test. How does a man use power? Is he gentle, or cruel? Does he defend the weak, succor the oppressed, or trample on the fallen?

If you will read again the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, you will find how Jehovah, the compassionate, whose name is enshrined in so many hearts, threatened to use his power.

"The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blasting and mildew. And thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. The Lord shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust." . . . . "And thy carcass shall be meat unto all fowls of the air and unto the beasts of the earth." . . . . "The Lord shall smite thee with madness and blindness. And thou shalt eat of the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and thy daughters. The tender and delicate woman among you, . . her eye shall be evil . . . toward her young one and toward her children which she shall bear; for she shall eat them."

Should it be found that these curses were in fact uttered by the God of hell, and that the translators had made a mistake in attributing them to Jehovah, could you say that the sentiments expressed are inconsistent with the supposed character of the Infinite Fiend?

A nation is judged by its laws—by the punishment it inflicts. The nation that punishes ordinary offences with death is regarded as barbarous, and the nation that tortures before it kills is denounced as savage.

What can you say of the government of Jehovah, in which death was the penalty for hundreds of offences?—death for the expression of an honest thought—death for touching with a good intention a sacred ark—death for making hair oil—for eating shew bread—for imitating incense and perfumery?

In the history of the world a more cruel code cannot be found. Crimes seem to have been invented to gratify a fiendish desire to shed the blood of men.

There is another test: How does a man treat the animals in his power—his faithful horse—his patient ox—his loving dog?

How did Jehovah treat the animals in Egypt? Would a loving God, with fierce hail from heaven, bruise and kill the innocent cattle for the crimes of their owners? Would he torment, torture and destroy them for the sins of men?

Jehovah was a God of blood. His altar was adorned with the horns of a beast. He established a religion in which every temple was a slaughter house, and every priest a butcher—a religion that demanded the death of the first-born, and delighted in the destruction of life.

There is still another test: The civilized man gives to others the rights that he claims for himself. He believes in the liberty of thought and expression, and abhors persecution for conscience sake.

Did Jehovah believe in the innocence of thought and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liberty of expression? Kindness is found with true greatness. Tyranny lodges only in the breast of the small, the narrow, the shriveled and the selfish. Did Jehovah teach and practice generosity? Was he a believer in religious liberty? If he was and is, in fact, God, he must have known, even four thousand years ago, that worship must be free, and that he who is forced upon his knees cannot, by any possibility, have the spirit of prayer.

Let me call your attention to a few passages in the thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy:

"If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, . . . thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die."

Is it possible for you to find in the literature of this world more awful passages than these? Did ever savagery, with strange and uncouth marks, with awkward forms of beast and bird, pollute the dripping walls of caves with such commands? Are these the words of infinite mercy? When they were uttered, did "righteousness and peace kiss each other"? How can any loving man or woman "encircle the name of Jehovah"—author of these words—"with profoundest reverence and love"? Do I rebel because my "constitution is warped, impaired and dislocated"? Is it because of "total depravity" that I denounce the brutality of Jehovah? If my heart were only good—if I loved my neighbor as myself—would I then see infinite mercy in these hideous words? Do I lack "reverential calm"?

These frightful passages, like coiled adders, were in the hearts of Jehovah's chosen people when they crucified "the Sinless Man."

Jehovah did not tell the husband to reason with his wife. She was to be answered only with death. She was to be bruised and mangled to a bleeding, shapeless mass of quivering flesh, for having breathed an honest thought.

If there is anything of importance in this world, it is the family, the home, the marriage of true souls, the equality of husband and wife—the true republicanism of the heart—the real democracy of the fireside.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us read the sixteenth verse of the third chapter of Genesis:

"Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

Never will I worship any being who added to the sorrows and agonies of maternity. Never will I bow to any God who introduced slavery into every home—who made the wife a slave and the husband a tyrant.

The Old Testament shows that Jehovah, like his creators, held women in contempt. They were regarded as property: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife,—nor his ox."

Why should a pure woman worship a God who upheld polygamy? Let us finish this subject: The institution of slavery involves all crimes. Jehovah was a believer in slavery. This is enough. Why should any civilized man worship him? Why should his name "be encircled with love and tenderness in any human heart"?

He believed that man could become the property of man—that it was right for his chosen people to deal in human flesh—to buy and sell mothers and babes. He taught that the captives were the property of the captors and directed his chosen people to kill, to enslave, or to pollute.

In the presence of these commandments, what becomes of the fine saying, "Love thy neighbor as thyself"? What shall we say of a God who established slavery, and then had the effrontery to say, "Thou shalt not steal"?

It may be insisted that Jehovah is the Father of all—and that he has "made of one blood all the nations of the earth." How then can we account for the wars of extermination? Does not the commandment "Love thy neighbor as thyself," apply to nations precisely the same as to individuals? Nations, like individuals, become great by the practice of virtue. How did Jehovah command his people to treat their neighbors?

He commanded his generals to destroy all, men, women and babes: "Thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth."

"I will make mine arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh."

"That thy foot may be dipped in the blood of thine enemies, and the tongue of thy dogs in the same."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"; . . . I will also send the teeth of beasts upon them, with the poison of serpents of the dust. . . . "

"The sword without and terror within shall destroy both the young man and the virgin, the suckling also, with the man of gray hairs."

Is it possible that these words fell from the lips of the Most Merciful?

You may reply that the inhabitants of Canaan were unfit to live—that they were ignorant and cruel. Why did not Jehovah, the "Father of all," give them the Ten Commandments? Why did he leave them without a bible, without prophets and priests? Why did he shower all the blessings of revelation on one poor and wretched tribe, and leave the great world in ignorance and crime—and why did he order his favorite children to murder those whom he had neglected?

By the question I asked of Dr. Field, the intention was to show that Jephthah, when he sacrificed his daughter to Jehovah, was as much the slave of superstition as is the Hindoo mother when she throws her babe into the yellow waves of the Ganges.

It seems that this savage Jephthah was in direct communication with Jehovah at Mizpeh, and that he made a vow unto the Lord and said:

"If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into mine hands, then it shall be that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up as a burnt offering."

In the first place, it is perfectly clear that the sacrifice intended was a human sacrifice, from the words: "that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me." Some human being—wife, daughter, friend, was expected to come. According to the account, his daughter—his only daughter—his only child—came first.

If Jephthah was in communication with God, why did God allow this man to make this vow; and why did he allow the daughter that he loved to be first, and why did he keep silent and allow the vow to be kept, while flames devoured the daughter's flesh?

St. Paul is not authority. He praises Samuel, the man who hewed Agag in pieces; David, who compelled hundreds to pass under the saws and harrows of death, and many others who shed the blood of the innocent and helpless. Paul is an unsafe guide.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He who commends the brutalities of the past, sows the seeds of future crimes.

If "believers are not obliged to approve of the conduct of Jephthah" are they free to condemn the conduct of Jehovah? If you will read the account you will see that the "spirit of the Lord was upon Jephthah" when he made the cruel vow. If Paul did not commend Jephthah for keeping this vow, what was the act that excited his admiration? Was it because Jephthah slew on the banks of the Jordan "forty and two thousand" of the sons of Ephraim?

In regard to Abraham, the argument is precisely the same, except that Jehovah is said to have interfered, and allowed an animal to be slain instead.

One of the answers given by you is that "it may be allowed that the narrative is not within our comprehension"; and for that reason you say that "it behooves us to tread cautiously in approaching it." Why cautiously?

These stories of Abraham and Jephthah have cost many an innocent life. Only a few years ago, here in my country, a man by the name of Freeman, believing that God demanded at least the show of obedience—believing what he had read in the Old Testament that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission," and so believing, touched with insanity, sacrificed his little girl—plunged into her innocent breast the dagger, believing it to be God's will, and thinking that if it were not God's will his hand would be stayed.

I know of nothing more pathetic than the story of this crime told by this man.

Nothing can be more monstrous than the conception of a God who demands sacrifice—of a God who would ask of a father that he murder his son—of a father that he would burn his daughter. It is far beyond my comprehension how any man ever could have believed such an infinite, such a cruel absurdity.

At the command of the real God—if there be one—I would not sacrifice my child, I would not murder my wife. But as long as there are people in the world whose minds are so that they can believe the stories of Abraham and Jephthah, just so long there will be men who will take the lives of the ones they love best.

You have taken the position that the conditions are different; and you say that: "According to the book of Genesis, Adam and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eve were placed under a law, not of consciously perceived right and wrong, but of simple obedience. The tree of which alone they were forbidden to eat was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; duty lay for them in following the command of the Most High, before and until they became capable of appreciating it by an ethical standard. Their knowledge was but that of an infant who has just reached the stage at which he can comprehend that he is ordered to do this or that, but not the nature of the things so ordered."

If Adam and Eve could not "consciously perceive right and wrong," how is it possible for you to say that "duty lay for them in following the command of the Most High"? How can a person "incapable of perceiving right and wrong" have an idea of duty? You are driven to say that Adam and Eve had no moral sense. How under such circumstances could they have the sense of guilt, or of obligation? And why should such persons be punished? And why should the whole human race become tainted by the offence of those who had no moral sense?

Do you intend to be understood as saying that Jehovah allowed his children to enslave each other because "duty lay for them in following the command of the Most High"? Was it for this reason that he caused them to exterminate each other? Do you account for the severity of his punishments by the fact that the poor creatures punished were not aware of the enormity of the offences they had committed? What shall we say of a God who has one of his children stoned to death for picking up sticks on Sunday, and allows another to enslave his fellow man? Have you discovered any theory that will account for both of these facts?

Another word as to Abraham:—You defend his willingness to kill his son because "the estimate of human life at the time was different"—because "the position of the father in the family was different; its members were regarded as in some sense his property;" and because "there is every reason to suppose that around Abraham in the 'land of Moriah' the practice of human sacrifice as an act of religion was in full vigor."

Let us examine these three excuses: Was Jehovah justified in putting a low estimate on human life? Was he in earnest when he said "that whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed"? Did he pander to the barbarian view of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worthlessness of life? If the estimate of human life was low, what was the sacrifice worth?

Was the son the property of the father? Did Jehovah uphold this savage view? Had the father the right to sell or kill his child?

Do you defend Jehovah and Abraham because the ignorant wretches in the "land of Moriah," knowing nothing of the true God, cut the throats of their babes "as an act of religion"?

Was Jehovah led away by the example of the Gods of Moriah? Do you not see that your excuses are simply the suggestions of other crimes?

You see clearly that the Hindoo mother, when she throws her babe into the Ganges at the command of her God, "sins against first principles"; but you excuse Abraham because he lived in the childhood of the race. Can Jehovah be excused because of his youth? Not satisfied with your explanation, your defences and excuses, you take the ground that when Abraham said: "My son, God will provide a lamb for a burnt offering," he may have "believed implicitly that a way of rescue would be found for his son." In other words, that Abraham did not believe that he would be required to shed the blood of Isaac. So that, after all, the faith of Abraham consisted in "believing implicitly" that Jehovah was not in earnest.

You have discovered a way by which, as you think, the neck of orthodoxy can escape the noose of Darwin, and in that connection you use this remarkable language:

"I should reply that the moral history of man, in its principal stream, has been distinctly an evolution from the first until now."

It is hard to see how this statement agrees with the one in the beginning of your Remarks, in which you speak of the human constitution in its "warped, impaired and dislocated" condition. When you wrote that line you were certainly a theologian—a believer in the Episcopal creed—and your mind, by mere force of habit, was at that moment contemplating man as he is supposed to have been created—perfect in every part. At that time you were endeavoring to account for the unbelief now in the world, and you did this by stating that the human constitution is "warped, impaired and dislocated"; but the moment you are brought face to face with the great truths uttered by Darwin, you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admit "that the moral history of man has been distinctly an evolution from the first until now." Is not this a fountain that brings forth sweet and bitter waters?

I insist, that the discoveries of Darwin do away absolutely with the inspiration of the Scriptures—with the account of creation in Genesis, and demonstrate not simply the falsity, not simply the wickedness, but the foolishness of the "sacred volume."

There is nothing in Darwin to show that all has been evolved from "primal night and from chaos." There is no evidence of "primal night." There is no proof of universal chaos. Did your Jehovah spend an eternity in "primal night," with no companion but chaos?

It makes no difference how long a lower form may require to reach a higher. It makes no difference whether forms can be simply modified, or absolutely changed. These facts have not the slightest tendency to throw the slightest light on the beginning or on the destiny of things.

I most cheerfully admit that gods have the right to create swiftly or slowly. The reptile may become a bird in one day, or in a thousand billion years—this fact has nothing to do with the existence or non-existence of a first cause, but it has something to do with the truth of the bible, and with the existence of a personal God of infinite power and wisdom.

Does not a gradual improvement in the thing created show a corresponding improvement in the creator? The church demonstrated the falsity and folly of Darwin's theories by showing that they contradicted the Mosaic account of creation, and now the theories of Darwin having been fairly established, the church says that the Mosaic account is true, because it is in harmony with Darwin. Now, if it should turn out that Darwin was mistaken, what then?

To me it is somewhat difficult to understand the mental processes of one who really feels that "the gap between man and the inferior animals or their relationship was stated, perhaps, even more emphatically by Bishop Butler than by Darwin."

Butler answered deists, who objected to the cruelties of the bible, and yet lauded the God of Nature by showing that the God of Nature is as cruel as the God of the bible. That is to say, he succeeded in showing that both Gods are bad. He had no possible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conception of the splendid generalizations of Darwin—the great truths that have revolutionized the thought of the world.

But there was one question asked by Bishop Butler that throws a flame of light upon the probable origin of most, if not all, religions: "Why might not whole communities and public bodies be seized with fits of insanity as well as individuals?"

If you are convinced that Moses and Darwin are in exact accord, will you be good enough to tell who, in your judgment, were the parents of Adam and Eve? Do you find in Darwin any theory that satisfactorily accounts for the "inspired fact" that a Rib, commencing with Monogonic Propagation—falling into halves by a contraction in the middle—reaching, after many ages of Evolution, the Amphigonic stage, and then, by the Survival of the Fittest, assisted by Natural Selection, moulded and modified by Environment, became at last, the mother of the human race?

Here is a world in which there are countless varieties of life—these varieties in all probability related to each other—all living upon each other—everything devouring something, and in its turn devoured by something else—everywhere claw and beak, hoof and tooth,—everything seeking the life of something else—every drop of water a battle field, every atom being for some wild beast a jungle—every place a golgotha—and such a world is declared to be the work of the infinitely wise and compassionate.

According to your idea, Jehovah prepared a home for his children—first a garden in which they should be tempted and from which they should be driven; then a world filled with briers and thorns and wild and poisonous beasts—a world in which the air should be filled with the enemies of human life—a world in which disease should be contagious, and in which it was impossible to tell, except by actual experiment, the poisonous from the nutritious. And these children were allowed to live in dens and holes and fight their way against monstrous serpents and crouching beasts—were allowed to live in ignorance and fear—to have false ideas of this good and loving God—ideas so false that they made of him a fiend—ideas so false, that they sacrificed their wives and babes to appease the imaginary wrath of this monster. And this God gave to different nations different ideas of himself, knowing that in consequence of that these nations would meet upon countless fields of death and drain each other's veins.

Would it not have been better had the world been so that par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ents would transmit only their virtues—only their perfections, physical and mental,—allowing their diseases and their vices to perish with them ?

In my reply to Dr. Field I had asked : Why should God demand a sacrifice from man ? Why should the infinite ask anything from the finite ? Should the sun beg from the glow-worm, and should the momentary spark excite the envy of the source of light ?

Upon which you remark, " that if the infinite is to make no demands upon the finite, by parity of reasoning, the great and strong should scarcely make them on the weak and small."

Can this be called reasoning ? Why should the infinite demand a sacrifice from man ? In the first place, the infinite is conditionless—the infinite cannot want—the infinite has. A conditioned being may want ; but the gratification of a want involves a change of condition. If God be conditionless, he can have no wants—consequently, no human being can gratify the infinite.

But you insist that " if the infinite is to make no demands upon the finite, by parity of reasoning the great and strong should scarcely make them on the weak and small."

The great have wants. The strong are often in need, in peril, and the great and strong often need the services of the small and weak. It was the mouse that freed the lion. England is a great and powerful nation—yet she may need the assistance of the weakest of her citizens. The world is filled with illustrations.

The lack of logic is in this : The infinite cannot want anything; the strong and the great may, and as a fact always do. The great and the strong cannot help the infinite—they can help the small and the weak, and the small and the weak can often help the great and strong.

You ask : " Why then should the father make demands of love, obedience, and sacrifice from his young child ? "

No sensible father ever demanded love from his child. Every civilized father knows that love rises like the perfume from a flower. You cannot command it by simple authority. It cannot obey. A father demands obedience from a child for the good of the child and for the good of himself. But suppose the father to be infinite—why should the child sacrifice anything for him ?

But it may be that you answer all these questions, all these dif-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ficulties, by admitting, as you have in your Remarks, "that these problems are insoluble by our understanding."

Why, then, do you accept them? Why do you defend that which you cannot understand? Why does your reason volunteer as a soldier under the flag of the incomprehensible?

I asked of Dr. Field, and I ask again, this question: Why should an infinitely wise and powerful God destroy the good and preserve the vile?

What do I mean by this question? Simply this: The earthquake, the lightning, the pestilence, are no respecters of persons. The vile are not always destroyed, the good are not always saved. I asked: Why should God treat all alike in this world, and in another make an infinite difference? This I suppose, is "insoluble to our understanding."

Why should Jehovah allow his worshipers, his adorers, to be destroyed by his enemies? Can you by any possibility answer this question?

You may account for all these inconsistencies, these cruel contradictions, as John Wesley accounted for earthquakes when he insisted that they were produced by the wickedness of men, and that the only way to prevent them was for everybody to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. And you may have some way of showing that Mr. Wesley's idea is entirely consistent with the theories of Mr. Darwin.

You seem to think that as long as there is more goodness than evil in the world—as long as there is more joy than sadness—we are compelled to infer that the author of the world is infinitely good, powerful, and wise, and that as long as a majority are out of gutters and prisons, the "divine scheme" is a success.

According to this system of logic, if there were a few more unfortunates—if there was just a little more evil than good—then we would be driven to acknowledge that the world was created by an infinitely malevolent being.

As a matter of fact, the history of the world has been such that not only your theologians but your apostles, and not only your apostles but your prophets, and not only your prophets but your Jehovah, have all been forced to account for the evil, the injustice and the suffering, by the wickedness of man, the natural depravity of the human heart and the wiles and machinations of a malevolent being second only in power to Jehovah himself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again and again you have called me to account for "mere suggestions and assertions without proof"; and yet your remarks are filled with assertions and mere suggestions without proof.

You admit that "great believers are not able to explain the inequalities of adjustment between human beings and the conditions in which they have been set down to work out their destiny."

How do you know "that they have been set down to work out their destiny"? If that was, and is, the purpose, then the being who settled the "destiny," and the means by which it was to be "worked out," is responsible for all that happens.

And is this the end of your argument, "That you are not able to explain the inequalities of adjustment between human beings"? Is the solution of this problem beyond your power? Does the bible shed no light? Is the Christian in the presence of this question as dumb as the agnostic? When the injustice of this world is so flagrant that you cannot harmonize that awful fact with the wisdom and goodness of an infinite God, do you not see that you have surrendered, or at least that you have raised a flag of truce beneath which your adversary accepts as final your statement that you do not know and that your imagination is not sufficient to frame an excuse for God?

It gave me great pleasure to find that at last even you have been driven to say that: "it is a duty incumbent upon us respectively according to our means and opportunities, to decide by the use of the faculty of reason given us, the great questions of natural and revealed religion."

You admit "that I am to decide for myself, by the use of my reason," whether the Bible is the word of God or not—whether there is any revealed religion—and whether there be or be not an infinite being who created and who governs this world.

You also admit that we are to decide these questions according to the balance of the evidence.

Is this in accordance with the doctrine of Jehovah? Did Jehovah say to the husband that if his wife became convinced, according to her means and her opportunities, and decided according to her reason, that it was better to worship some other God than Jehovah, then that he was to say to her: "You are entitled to decide according to the balance of the evidence as it seems to you"?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Have you abandoned Jehovah? Is man more just than he? Have you appealed from him to the standard of reason? Is it possible that the leader of the English Liberals is nearer civilized than Jehovah?

Do you know that in this sentence you demonstrate the existence of a dawn in your mind? This sentence makes it certain that in the East of the midnight of Episcopal superstition there is the herald of the coming day. And if this sentence shows a dawn, what shall I say of the next:

"We are not entitled, either for or against belief, to set up in this province any rule of investigation except such as common sense teaches us to use in the ordinary conduct of life"?

This certainly is a morning star. Let me take this statement, let me hold it as a torch, and by its light I beg of you to read the bible once again.

Is it in accordance with reason that an infinitely good and loving God would drown a world that he had taken no means to civilize—to whom he had given no bible, no gospel,—taught no scientific fact and in which the seeds of art had not been sown; that he would create a world that ought to be drowned? That a being of infinite wisdom would create a rival, knowing that the rival would fill perdition with countless souls destined to suffer eternal pain? Is it according to common sense that an infinitely good God would order some of his children to kill others? That he would command soldiers to rip open with the sword of war the bodies of women—wreaking vengeance on babes unborn? Is it according to reason that a good, loving, compassionate, and just God would establish slavery among men, and that a pure God would uphold polygamy? Is it according to common sense that he who wished to make men merciful and loving would demand the sacrifice of animals, so that his altars would be wet with the blood of oxen, sheep, and doves? Is it according to reason that a good God would inflict tortures upon his ignorant children—that he would torture animals to death—and is it in accordance with common sense and reason that this God would create countless billions of people knowing that they would be eternally damned?

What is common sense? Is it the result of observation, reason and experience, or is it the child of credulity?

There is this curious fact: The far past and the far future seem to belong to the miraculous and the monstrous. The pres-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ent, as a rule, is the realm of common sense. If you say to a man: "Eighteen hundred years ago the dead were raised," he will reply: "Yes, I know that." And if you say: "A hundred thousand years from now all the dead will be raised," he will probably reply: "I presume so." But if you tell him: "I saw a dead man raised to-day," he will ask, "From what madhouse have you escaped?"

The moment we decide "according to reason," "according to the balance of evidence," we are charged with "having violated the laws of social morality and decency," and the defender of the miraculous and the incomprehensible takes another position.

The theologian has a city of refuge to which he flies—an old breastwork behind which he kneels—a rifle-pit into which he crawls. You have described this city, this breastwork, this rifle-pit and also the leaf under which the ostrich of theology thrusts its head. Let me quote:

"Our demands for evidence must be limited by the general reason of the case. Does that general reason of the case make it probable that a finite being, with a finite place in a comprehensive scheme devised and administered by a being who is infinite, would be able even to embrace within his view, or rightly to appreciate all the motives or aims that there may have been in the mind of the divine disposer?"

And this is what you call "deciding by the use of the faculty of reason," "according to the evidence," or at least "according to the balance of evidence." This is a conclusion reached by a "rule of investigation such as common sense teaches us to use in the ordinary conduct of life." Will you have the kindness to explain what it is to act contrary to evidence, or contrary to common sense? Can you imagine a superstition so gross that it cannot be defended by that argument?

Nothing, it seems to me, could have been easier than for Jehovah to have reasonably explained his scheme. You may answer that the human intellect is not sufficient to understand the explanation. Why then do not theologians stop explaining? Why do they feel it incumbent upon them to explain that which they admit God would have explained had the human mind been capable of understanding it?

How much better would it have been if Jehovah had said a few things on these subjects. It always seemed wonderful to me that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he spent several days and night on Mount Sinai explaining to Moses how he could detect the presence of leprosy, without once thinking to give him a prescription for its cure.

There were thousands and thousands of opportunities for this God to withdraw from these questions the shadow and the cloud. When Jehovah out of the whirlwind asked questions of Job, how much better it would have been if Job had asked and Jehovah had answered.

You say that we should be governed by evidence and by common sense. Then you tell us that the questions are beyond the reach of reason, and with which common sense has nothing to do. If we then ask for an explanation, you reply in the scornful challenge of Dante.

You seem to imagine that every man who gives an opinion, takes his solemn oath that the opinion is the absolute end of all investigation on that subject.

In my opinion, Shakespeare was, intellectually, the greatest of the human race, and my intention was simply to express that view. It never occurred to me that any one would suppose that I thought Shakespeare a greater actor than Garrick, a more wonderful composer than Wagner, a better violinist than Remenyi, or a heavier man than Daniel Lambert. It is to be regretted that you were misled by my words and really supposed that I intended to say that Shakespeare was a greater general than Cæsar. But, after all, your criticism has no possible bearing on the point at issue. Is it an effort to avoid that which cannot be met? The real question is this: If we cannot account for Christ without a miracle, how can we account for Shakespeare? Dr. Field took the ground that Christ himself was a miracle; that it was impossible to account for such a being in any natural way; and, guided by common sense, guided by the rule of investigation such as common sense teaches, I called attention to Buddha, Mohammed, Confucius, and Shakespeare.

In another place in your Remarks, when my statement about Shakespeare was not in your mind, you say: "All is done by steps—nothing by strides, leaps or bounds—all from protoplasm up to Shakespeare." Why did you end the series with Shakespeare? Did you intend to say Dante, or Bishop Butler?

It is curious to see how much ingenuity a great man exercises when guided by what he calls "the rule of investigation as sug

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gested by common sense." I pointed out some things that Christ did not teach—among others, that he said nothing with regard to the family relation, nothing against slavery, nothing about education, nothing as to the rights and duties of nations, nothing as to any scientific truth. And this is answered by saying that "I am quite able to point out the way in which the Saviour of the world might have been much greater as a teacher than he actually was."

Is this an answer, or is it simply taking refuge behind a name? Would it not have been better if Christ had told his disciples that they must not persecute; that they had no right to destroy their fellow men; that they must not put heretics in dungeons, or destroy them with flames; that they must not invent and use instruments of torture; that they must not appeal to brutality, nor endeavor to sow with bloody hands the seeds of peace? Would it not have been far better had he said: "I come not to bring a sword, but peace"? Would not this have saved countless cruelties and countless lives?

You seem to think that you have fully answered my objection when you say that Christ taught the absolute indissolubility of marriage.

Why should a husband and wife be compelled to live with each other after love is dead? Why should the wife still be bound in indissoluble chains to a husband who is cruel, infamous, and false? Why should her life be destroyed because of his? Why should she be chained to a criminal and an outcast? Nothing can be more unphilosophic than this. Why fill the world with the children of indifference and hatred?

The marriage contract is the most important, the most sacred, that human beings can make. It will be sacredly kept by good men and by good women. But if a loving woman—tender, noble, and true—makes this contract with a man whom she believed to be worthy of all respect and love, and who is found to be a cruel, worthless wretch, why should her life be lost?

Do you not know that the indissolubility of the marriage contract leads to its violation, forms an excuse for immorality, eats out the very heart of truth, and gives to vice that which alone belongs to love?

But in order that you may know why the objection was raised, I call your attention to the fact that Christ offered a reward, not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only in this world but in another, to any husband who would desert his wife. And do you know that this hideous offer caused millions to desert their wives and children ?

Theologians have the habit of using names instead of arguments—of appealing to some man, great in some direction, to establish their creed ; but we all know that no man is great enough to be an authority, except in that particular domain in which he won his eminence ; and we all know that great men are not great in all directions. Bacon died a believer in the Ptolemaic system of astronomy. Tycho Brahe kept an imbecile in his service, putting down with great care the words that fell from the hanging lip of idiocy, and then endeavored to put them together in a way to form prophesies. Sir Matthew Hale believed in witchcraft not only, but in its lowest and most vulgar forms ; and some of the greatest men of antiquity examined the entrails of birds to find the secrets of the future.

It has always seemed to me that reasons are better than names.

After taking the ground that Christ could not have been a greater teacher than he actually was, you ask: "Where would have been the wisdom of delivering to an uninstructed population of a particular age a codified religion which was to serve for all nations, all ages, all states of civilization ?"

Does not this question admit that the teachings of Christ will not serve for all nations, all ages and all states of civilization ?

But let me ask: If it was necessary for Christ "to deliver to an uninstructed population of a particular age a certain religion suited only for that particular age," why should a civilized and scientific age eighteen hundred years afterwards be absolutely bound by that religion ? Do you not see that your position cannot be defended, and that you have provided no way for retreat ? If the religion of Christ was for that age, is it for this ? Are you willing to admit that the Ten Commandments are not for all time ? If, then, four thousand years before Christ, commandments were given not simply for "an uninstructed population of a particular age, but for all time," can you give a reason why the religion of Christ should not have been of the same character ?

In the first place you say that God has revealed himself to the world—that he has revealed a religion ; and in the next place, that "he has not revealed a perfect religion, for the reason that no room would be left for the career of human thought."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why did not God reveal this imperfect religion to all people instead of to a small and insignificant tribe, a tribe without commerce and without influence among the nations of the world? Why did he hide this imperfect light under a bushel? If the light was necessary for one, was it not necessary for all? And why did he drown a world to whom he had not even given that light?

According to your reasoning, would there not have been left greater room for the career of human thought, had no revelation been made?

You say that "you have known a person who after studying the old classical or Olympian religion for a third part of a century, at length began to hope that he had some partial comprehension of it—some inkling of what is meant." You say this for the purpose of showing how impossible it is to understand the bible. If it is so difficult, why do you call it a revelation? And yet, according to your creed, the man who does not understand the revelation and believe it, or who does not believe it, whether he understands it or not, is to reap the harvest of everlasting pain. Ought not the revelation to be revealed?

In order to escape from the fact that Christ denounced the chosen people of God as "a generation of vipers" and as "whited sepulchres," you take the ground that the scribes and pharisees were not the chosen people. Of what blood were they? It will not do to say that they were not the people. Can you deny that Christ addressed the chosen people when he said: "Jerusalem, which killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee"?

You have called me to an account for what I said in regard to Ananias and Sapphira. *First,* I am charged with having said that the apostles conceived the idea of having all things in common, and you denounce this as an interpolation; *second,* "that motives of prudence are stated as a matter of fact to have influenced the offending couple"—and this is charged as an interpolation; and, *third,* that I stated that the apostles sent for the wife of Ananias—and this is characterized as a pure invention.

To me it seems reasonable to suppose that the idea of having all things in common was conceived by those who had nothing, or had the least, and not by those who had plenty. In the last verses of the fourth chapter of the Acts, you will find this:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Neither was there any among them that lacked, for as many as were possessed of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need. And Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas (which is, being interpreted, the son of consolation), a Levite and of the country of Cyprus, having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles' feet.

Now it occurred to me that the idea was in all probability suggested by the men at whose feet the property was laid. It never entered my mind that the idea originated with those who had land for sale. There may be a different standard by which human nature is measured in your country, than in mine; but if the thing had happened in the United States, I feel absolutely positive that it would have been at the suggestion of the apostles.

"Ananias, with Sapphira, his wife, sold a possession and kept back part of the price, his wife also being privy to it, and brought a certain part and laid it at the apostles' feet."

In my Letter to Dr. Field I stated—not at the time pretending to quote from the New Testament—that Ananias and Sapphira, after talking the matter over, not being entirely satisfied with the collaterals, probably concluded to keep a little—just enough to keep them from starvation if the good and pious bankers should abscond. It never occurred to me that any man would imagine that this was a quotation, and I feel like asking your pardon for having led you into this error. We are informed in the bible that "they kept back a part of the price." It occurred to me, "judging by the rule of investigation according to common sense," that there was a reason for this, and I could think of no reason except that they did not care to trust the apostles with all, and that they kept back just a little, thinking it might be useful if the rest should be lost.

According to the account, after Peter had made a few remarks to Ananias,

"Ananias fell down and gave up the ghost; . . . . and the young men arose, wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him. And it was about the space of three hours after, when his wife, not knowing what was done, came in."

Whereupon Peter said:

"'Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much?' And she said, 'Yea, for so much.' Then Peter said unto her, 'How is it that ye have agreed together to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tempt the spirit of the Lord? Behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out.' Then fell she down straightway at his feet, and yielded up the ghost; and the young men came in, and found her dead, and, carrying her forth, buried her by her husband."

The only objection found to this is, that I inferred that the apostles had sent for her. Sending for her was not the offence. The failure to tell her what had happened to her husband was the offence—keeping his fate a secret from her in order that she might be caught in the same net that had been set for her husband by Jehovah. This was the offence. This was the mean and cruel thing to which I objected. Have you answered that?

Of course, I feel sure that the thing never occurred—the probability being that Ananias and Sapphira never lived and never died. It is probably a story invented by the early church to make the collection of subscriptions somewhat easier.

And yet, we find a man in the Nineteenth century, foremost of his fellow-citizens in the affairs of a great nation, upholding this barbaric view of God.

Let me beg of you to use your reason "according to the rule suggested by common sense." Let us do what little we can to rescue the reputation, even of a Jewish myth, from the calumnies of Ignorance and Fear.

So, again, I am charged with having given certain words as a quotation from the bible in which two passages are combined—"They who believe and are baptized shall be saved, and they who believe not shall be damned. And these shall go away into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels."

They were given as two passages. No one for a moment supposed that they would be read together as one, and no one imagined that any one in answering the argument would be led to believe that they were intended as one. Neither was there in this the slightest negligence, as I was answering a man who is perfectly familiar with the bible. The objection was too small to make. It is hardly large enough to answer—and had it not been made by you it would not have been answered.

You are not satisfied with what I have said upon the subject of immortality. What I said was this: The idea of immortality, that like a sea has ebbed and flowed in the human heart, with its countless waves of hope and fear beating against the shores and rocks of time and fate, was not born of any book, nor of any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creed, nor of any religion. It was born of human affection, and it will continue to ebb and flow beneath the mists and clouds of doubt and darkness as long as love kisses the lips of death.

You answer this by saying that "the Egyptians were believers in immortality, but were not a people of high intellectual development."

How such a statement tends to answer what I have said, is beyond my powers of discernment. Is there the slightest connection between my statement and your objection?

You make still another answer, and say that "the ancient Greeks were a race of perhaps unparalleled intellectual capacity, and that notwithstanding that, the most powerful mind of the Greek philosophy, that of Aristotle, had no clear conception of a personal existence in a future state?" May I be allowed to ask this simple question: Who has?

Are you urging an objection to the dogma of immortality, when you say that a race of unparalleled intellectual capacity had no confidence in it? Is that a doctrine believed only by people who lack intellectual capacity? I stated that the idea of immortality was born of love. You reply, "The Egyptians believed it, but they were not intellectual." Is not this a *non sequitur?* The question is: Were they a loving people?

Does history show that there is a moral governor of the world? What witnesses shall we call? The billions of slaves who were paid with blows?—the countless mothers whose babes were sold? Have we time to examine the Waldenses, the Covenanters of Scotland, the Catholics of Ireland, the victims of St. Bartholomew, of the Spanish Inquisition, all those who have died in flames? Shall we hear the story of Bruno? Shall we ask Servetus? Shall we ask the millions slaughtered by Christian swords in America—all the victims of ambition, of perjury, of ignorance, of superstition and revenge, of storm and earthquake, of famine, flood, and fire?

Can all the agonies and crimes, can all the inequalities of the world be answered by reading the "noble Psalm" in which are found the words: "Call upon me in the day of trouble, so I will hear thee, and thou shalt praise me?" Do you prove the truth of these fine words, this honey of Trebizond, by the victims of religious persecution? Shall we hear the sighs and sobs of Siberia?

Another thing. Why should you, from the page of Greek

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

history, with the sponge of your judgment, wipe out all names but one, and tell us that the most powerful mind of the Greek philosophy was that of Aristotle? How did you ascertain this fact? Is it not fair to suppose that you merely intended to say that, according to your view, Aristotle had the most powerful mind among all the philosophers of Greece? I should not call attention to this, except for your criticism on a like remark of mine as to the intellectual superiority of Shakespeare. But if you knew the trouble I have had in finding out your meaning, from your words, you would pardon me for calling attention to a single line from Aristotle: "Clearness is the virtue of style."

To me Epicurus seems far greater than Aristotle. He had clearer vision. His cheek was closer to the breast of nature, and he planted his philosophy nearer to the bed-rock of fact. He was practical enough to know that virtue is the means and happiness the end; that the highest philosophy is the art of living. He was wise enough to say that nothing is of the slightest value to man that does not increase or preserve his well-being, and he was great enough to know and courageous enough to declare that all the gods and ghosts were monstrous phantoms born of ignorance and fear.

I still insist that human affection is the foundation of the idea of immortality; that love was the first to speak that word, no matter whether they who spoke it were savage or civilized, Egyptian or Greek. But if we are immortal—if there be another world—why was it not clearly set forth in the Old Testament? Certainly, the authors of that book had an opportunity to learn it from the Egyptians. Why was it not revealed by Jehovah? Why did he waste his time in giving orders for the consecration of priests—in saying that they must have sheep's blood put on their right ears and on their right thumbs and on their right big toes? Could a God with any sense of humor give such directions, or watch without huge laughter the performance of such a ceremony? In order to see the beauty, the depth and tenderness of such a consecration, is it essential to be in a state of "reverential calm?"

Is it not strange that Christ did not tell of another world distinctly, clearly, without parable, and without the mist of metaphor?

The fact is that the Hindoos, the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans taught the immortality of the soul, not as a glittering

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guess—a possible perhaps—but as a clear and demonstrated truth for many centuries before the birth of Christ.

If the Old Testament proves anything, it is that death ends all. And the New Testament, by basing immortality on the resurrection of the body, but "keeps the word of promise to our ear and breaks it to our hope."

In my Reply to Dr. Field, I said: "The truth is, that no one can justly be held responsible for his thoughts. The brain thinks without asking our consent; we believe, or disbelieve, without an effort of the will. Belief is a result. It is the effect of evidence upon the mind. The scales turn in spite of him who watches. There is no opportunity of being honest or dishonest in the formation of an opinion. The conclusion is entirely independent of desire. We must believe, or we must doubt, in spite of what we wish."

Does the brain think without our consent? Can we control our thought? Can we tell what we are going to think to-morrow?

Can we stop thinking?

Is belief the result of that which to us is evidence, or is it a product of the will? Can the scales in which reason weighs evidence be turned by the will? Why then should evidence be weighed? If it all depends on the will, what is evidence? Is there any opportunity of being dishonest in the formation of an opinion? Must not the man who forms the opinion know what it is? He cannot knowingly cheat himself. He cannot be deceived with dice that he loads. He cannot play unfairly at solitaire without knowing that he has lost the game. He cannot knowingly weigh with false scales and believe in the correctness of the result.

You have not even attempted to answer my arguments upon these points, but you have unconsciously avoided them. You did not attack the citadel. In military parlance, you proceeded to "shell the woods." The noise is precisely the same as though every shot had been directed against the enemy's position, but the result is not. You do not seem willing to implicitly trust the correctness of your aim. You prefer to place the target after the shot.

The question is whether the will knowingly can change evidence, and whether there is any opportunity of being dishonest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the formation of an opinion. You have changed the issue. You have erased the word formation and interpolated the word expression.

Let us suppose that a man has given an opinion, knowing that it is not based on any fact. Can you say that he has given his opinion? The moment a prejudice is known to be a prejudice, it disappears. Ignorance is the soil in which prejudice must grow. Touched by a ray of light, it dies. The judgment of man may be warped by prejudice and passion, but it cannot be consciously warped. It is impossible for any man to be influenced by a known prejudice, because a known prejudice cannot exist.

I am not contending that all opinions have been honestly expressed. What I contend is that when a dishonest opinion has been expressed it is not the opinion that was formed.

The cases suggested by you are not in point. Fathers are honestly swayed, if really swayed, by love; and queens and judges have pretended to be swayed by the highest motives, by the clearest evidence, in order that they might kill rivals, reap rewards, and gratify revenge. But what has all this to do with the fact that he who watches the scales in which evidence is weighed knows the actual result?

Let us examine your case: If a father is *consciously* swayed by his love for his son, and for that reason says that his son is innocent, then he has not expressed his opinion. If he is unconsciously swayed and says that his son is innocent, then he has expressed his opinion. In both instances his opinion was independent of his will; but in the first instance he did not express his opinion. You will certainly see this distinction between the formation and the expression of an opinion.

The same argument applies to the man who consciously has a desire to condemn. Such a *conscious* desire cannot affect the testimony—cannot affect the opinion. Queen Elizabeth undoubtedly desired the death of Mary Stuart, but this conscious desire could not have been the foundation on which rested Elizabeth's opinion as to the guilt or innocence of her rival. It is barely possible that Elizabeth did not express her real opinion. Do you believe that the English judges in the matter of the Popish Plot gave judgment in accordance with their opinions? Are you satisfied that Napoleon expressed his real opinion when he justified himself for the assassination of the Duc d'Enghien?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If you answer these questions in the affirmative, you admit that I am right. If you answer in the negative, you admit that you are wrong. The moment you admit that the opinion formed cannot be changed by expressing a pretended opinion, your argument is turned against yourself.

It is admitted that prejudice strengthens, weakens and colors evidence; but prejudice is honest. And when one acts knowingly against the evidence, that is not by reason of prejudice.

According to my views of propriety, it would be unbecoming for me to say that your argument on these questions is "a piece of plausible shallowness." Such language might be regarded as lacking "reverential calm," and I therefore refrain from even characterizing it as plausible.

Is it not perfectly apparent that you have changed the issue, and that instead of showing that opinions are creatures of the will, you have discussed the quality of actions? What have corrupt and cruel judgments pronounced by corrupt and cruel judges to do with their real opinions? When a judge forms one opinion and renders another he is called corrupt. The corruption does not consist in forming his opinion, but in rendering one that he did not form. Does a dishonest creditor, who incorrectly adds a number of items making the aggregate too large, necessarily change his opinion as to the relations of numbers? When an error is known, it is not a mistake; but a conclusion reached by a mistake, or by a prejudice, or by both, is a necessary conclusion. He who pretends to come to a conclusion by a mistake which he knows is not a mistake, knows that he has not expressed his real opinion.

Can any thing be more illogical than the assertion that because a boy reaches, through negligence in adding figures, a wrong result, that he is accountable for his opinion of the result? If he knew he was negligent what must his opinion of the result have been?

So with the man who boldly announces that he has discovered the numerical expression of the relation sustained by the diameter to the circumference of a circle. If he is honest in the announcement, then the announcement was caused not by his will but by his ignorance. His will cannot make the announcement true, and he could not by any possibility have supposed that his will could affect the correctness of his announcement. The will of one who thinks that he has invented or discovered what is called

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perpetual motion, is not at fault. The man, if honest, has been misled; if not honest, he endeavors to mislead others. There is prejudice, and prejudice does raise a clamor, and the intellect is affected and the judgment is darkened and the opinion is deformed; but the prejudice is real and the clamor is sincere and the judgment is upright and the opinion is honest.

The intellect is not always supreme. It is surrounded by clouds. It sometimes sits in darkness. It is often misled—sometimes, in superstitious fear, it abdicates. It is not always a white light. The passions and prejudices are prismatic—they color thoughts. Desires betray the judgment and cunningly mislead the will.

You seem to think that the fact of responsibility is in danger unless it rests upon the will, and this will you regard as something without a cause, springing into being in some mysterious way without father or mother, without seed or soil, or rain or light. You must admit that man is a conditioned being—that he has wants, objects, ends, and aims, and that these are gratified and attained only by the use of means. Do not these wants and these objects have something to do with the will, and does not the intellect have something to do with the means? Is not the will a product? Independently of conditions, can it exist? Is it not necessarily produced? Behind every wish and thought, every dream and fancy, every fear and hope, are there not countless causes? Man feels shame. What does this prove? He pities himself. What does this demonstrate?

The dark continent of motive and desire has never been explored. In the brain, that wondrous world with one inhabitant, there are recesses dim and dark, treacherous sands and dangerous shores, where seeming sirens tempt and fade; streams that rise in unknown lands from hidden springs, strange seas with ebb and flow of tides, resistless billows urged by storms of flame, profound and awful depths hidden by mist of dreams, obscure and phantom realms where vague and fearful things are half revealed, jungles where passion's tigers crouch, and skies of cloud and blue where fancies fly with painted wings that dazzle and mislead; and the poor sovereign of this pictured world is led by old desires and ancient hates, and stained by crimes of many vanished years, and pushed by hands that long ago were dust, until he feels like some bewildered slave that Mockery has throned and crowned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No one pretends that the mind of man is perfect—that it is not affected by desires, colored by hopes, weakened by fears, deformed by ignorance and distorted by superstition. But all this has nothing to do with the innocence of opinion.

It may be that the Thugs were taught that murder is innocent; but did the teachers believe what they taught? Did the pupils believe the teachers? Did not Jehovah teach that the act that we describe as murder was a duty? Were not his teachings practiced by Moses and Joshua and Jephthah and Samuel and David? Were they honest? But what has all this to do with the point at issue?

Society has the right to protect itself, even from honest murderers and conscientious thieves. The belief of the criminal does not disarm society; it protects itself from him as from a poisonous serpent, or from a beast that lives on human flesh. We are under no obligation to stand still and allow ourselves to be murdered by one who honestly thinks that it is his duty to take our lives. And yet according to your argument, we have no right to defend ourselves from honest Thugs. Was Saul of Tarsus a Thug when he persecuted Christians "even unto strange cities"? Is the Thug of India more ferocious than Torquemada, the Thug of Spain?

If belief depends upon the will, can all men have correct opinions who will to have them? Acts are good, or bad, according to their consequences, and not according to the intentions of the actors. Honest opinions may be wrong, and opinions dishonestly expressed may be right.

Do you mean to say that because passion and prejudice, the reckless "pilots 'twixt the dangerous shores of will and judgment," sway the mind, that the opinions which you have expressed in your Remarks to me are not your opinions? Certainly you will admit that in all probability you have prejudices and passions, and if so, can the opinions that you have expressed, according to your argument, be honest? My lack of confidence in your argument gives me perfect confidence in your candor. You may remember the philosopher who retained his reputation for veracity, in spite of the fact that he kept saying: "There is no truth in man."

Are only those opinions honest that are formed without any interference of passion, affection, habit or fancy? What would the opinion of a man without passions, affections, or fancies be worth?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The alchemist gave up his search for an universal solvent upon being asked in what kind of vessel he expected to keep it when found.

It may be admitted that Biel "shows us how the life of Dante co-operated with his extraordinary natural gifts and capabilities to make him what he was," but does this tend to show that Dante changed his opinions by an act of his will, or that he reached honest opinions by knowingly using false weights and measures?

You must admit that the opinions, habits and religions of men depend, at least in some degree, on race, occupation, training and capacity. Is not every thoughtful man compelled to agree with Edgar Fawcett, in whose brain are united the beauty of the poet and the subtlety of the logician,

> "Who sees how vice her venom wreaks
> On the frail babe before it speaks,
> And how heredity enslaves
> With ghostly hands that reach from graves"?

Why do you hold the intellect criminally responsible for opinions, when you admit that it is controlled by the will? And why do you hold the will responsible, when you insist that it is swayed by the passions and affections? But all this has nothing to do with the fact that every opinion has been honestly formed, whether honestly expressed or not.

No one pretends that all governments have been honestly formed and honestly administered. All vices, and some virtues, are represented in most nations. In my opinion a republic is far better than a monarchy. The legally expressed will of the people is the only rightful sovereign. This sovereignty, however, does not embrace the realm of thought or opinion. In that world, each human being is a sovereign,—throned and crowned: One is a majority. The good citizens of that realm give to others all rights that they claim for themselves, and those who appeal to force are the only traitors.

The existence of theological despotisms, of God-anointed kings, does not tend to prove that a known prejudice can determine the weight of evidence. When men were so ignorant as to suppose that God would destroy them unless they burned heretics, they lighted the fagots in self-defence.

Feeling as I do that man is not responsible for his opinions, I characterized persecution for opinion's sake as infamous. So, it is perfectly clear to me, that it would be the infamy of infamies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for an infinite being to create vast numbers of men knowing that they would suffer eternal pain. If an infinite God creates a man on purpose to damn him, or creates him knowing that he will be damned, is not the crime the same? We make mistakes and failures because we are finite; but can you conceive of any excuse for an infinite being who creates failures? If you had the power to change, by a wish, a statue into a human being, and you knew that this being would die without a "change of heart" and suffer endless pain, what would you do?

Can you think of any excuse for an earthly father, who, having wealth, learning and leisure, leaves his own children in ignorance and darkness? Do you believe that a God of infinite wisdom, justice and love, called countless generations of men into being, knowing that they would be used as fuel for the eternal fire?

Many will regret that you did not give your views upon the main questions—the principal issues—involved, instead of calling attention, for the most part, to the unimportant. If men were discussing the causes and results of the Franco-Prussian war, it would hardly be worth while for a third person to interrupt the argument for the purpose of calling attention to a misspelled word in the terms of surrender.

If we admit that man is responsible for his opinions and his thoughts, and that his will is perfectly free, still these admissions do not even tend to prove the inspiration of the bible, or the "divine scheme of redemption."

In my judgment, the days of the supernatural are numbered. The dogma of inspiration must be abandoned. As man advances, —as his intellect enlarges,—as his knowledge increases,—as his ideals become nobler, the bibles and creeds will lose their authority—the miraculous will be classed with the impossible, and the idea of special providence will be discarded. Thousands of religions have perished, innumerable gods have died, and why should the religion of our time be exempt from the common fate?

Creeds cannot remain permanent in a world in which knowledge increases. Science and superstition cannot peaceably occupy the same brain. This is an age of investigation, of discovery and thought. Science destroys the dogmas that mislead the mind and waste the energies of man. It points out the ends that can be accomplished; takes into consideration the limits of our faculties; fixes our attention on the affairs of this world, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erects beacons of warning on the dangerous shores. It seeks to ascertain the conditions of health, to the end that life may be enriched and lengthened, and it reads with a smile this passage:

"And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them."

Science is the enemy of fear and credulity. It invites investigation, challenges the reason, stimulates inquiry, and welcomes the unbeliever. It seeks to give food and shelter, and raiment, education and liberty to the human race. It welcomes every fact and every truth. It has furnished a foundation for morals, a philosophy for the guidance of man. From all books it selects the good, and from all theories, the true. It seeks to civilize the human race by the cultivation of the intellect and heart. It refines through art, music and the drama—giving voice and expression to every noble thought. The mysterious does not excite the feeling of worship, but the ambition to understand. It does not pray—it works. It does not answer inquiry with the malicious cry of "blasphemy." Its feelings are not hurt by contradiction, neither does it ask to be protected by law from the laughter of heretics. It has taught man that he cannot walk beyond the horizon—that the questions of origin and destiny cannot be answered—that an infinite personality cannot be comprehended by a finite being, and that the truth of any system of religion based on the supernatural cannot by any possibility be established—such a religion not being within the domain of evidence. And, above all, it teaches that all our duties are here—that all our obligations are to sentient beings; that intelligence, guided by kindness, is the highest possible wisdom; and that "man believes not what he would, but what he can."

And after all, it may be that "to ride an unbroken horse with the reins thrown upon his neck"—as you charge me with doing—gives a greater variety of sensations, a keener delight, and a better prospect of winning the race than to sit solemnly astride of a dead one, in "a deep reverential calm," with the bridle firmly in your hand.

Again assuring you of my profound respect, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PERFECTED PHONOGRAPH.

TEN years ago I contributed to the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW (May-June, 1878), a paper on the "Phonograph and its Future," in which I sketched the solution of certain problems accomplished by my invention, and predicted some of the uses to which it would be put. Other weighty matters engaged much of my time and attention after that article was published, but the future of which I then spoke has now arrived, and the predictions which I made at that time are now verified. For, when these words appear in print, the demonstration of the phonograph's practical adaptability to the purposes mentioned by me will have been completed, and the perfected instrument itself will be in the hands of the public, to be tested and employed by them at will. Rumors, I understand, have been circulated to the effect that, subsequently to my announcements made ten years ago, I allowed the phonograph to go adrift, leaving its further development to chance and to the tender mercies of such disinterested persons, not connected with me, as might conceive that they were doing me a favor by claiming to have developed my idea. Those who may have been taken in by these rumors would do well to inform themselves concerning the prolonged labor involved in carrying out important inventions. They are also referred to my former statements in this REVIEW, as proof that the signer of those statements at least knew clearly what he was talking about and predicted only that which he has now fulfilled.

Since the time of Lucretius, the movements of atoms have been invested with an intense interest for philosophers and scientific students, and the wave-motions of light, heat and sound have engaged, with a constantly increasing degree of importance, the attention of modern investigators. When we consider the relation of these motions to mathematics and to music, the conception of Pythagoras that number and harmony constituted the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principle of the Universe does not seem to be very far out of the way. In the phonograph we find an illustration of the truth that human speech is governed by the laws of number, harmony and rhythm. And by means of these laws, we are now able to register all sorts of sound and all articulate utterance—even to the lightest shades and variations of the voice—in lines or dots which are an absolute equivalent for the emission of sound by the lips; so that, through this contrivance, we can cause these lines and dots to give forth again the sound of the voice, of music, and all other sounds recorded by them, whether audible or *inaudible*. For it is a very extraordinary fact that, while the deepest tone that our ears are capable of recognizing is one containing 16 vibrations a second, the phonograph will record 10 vibrations or less, and can then raise the pitch until we hear a reproduction from them. Similarly, vibrations above the highest rate audible to the ear can be recorded on the phonograph and then reproduced by lowering the pitch, until we actually hear the record of those inaudible pulsations.

To make the general idea of the recording of sound more clear, let me remark one or two points. We have all been struck by the precision with which even the faintest sea-waves impress upon the surface of a beach the fine, sinuous line which is formed by the rippling edge of their advance. Almost as familiar is the fact that grains of sand sprinkled on a smooth surface of glass or wood, on or near a piano, sift themselves into various lines and curves according to the vibrations of the melody played on the piano-keys. These things indicate how easily the particles of solid matter may receive an imparted motion, or take an impression, from delicate liquid waves, air waves, or waves of sound. Yet, well known though these phenomena are, they apparently never suggested until within a few years that the sound-waves set going by a human voice might be so directed as to trace an impression upon some solid substance, with a nicety equal to that of the tide in recording its flow upon a sand beach.

My own discovery that this could be done came to me almost accidentally while I was busy with experiments having a different object in view. I was engaged upon a machine intended to repeat Morse characters, which were recorded on paper by indentations that transferred their message to another circuit automatically, when passed under a tracing-point connected with a circuit-clos-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing apparatus. In manipulating this machine I found that when the cylinder carrying the indented paper was turned with great swiftness, it gave off a humming noise from the indentations—a musical, rhythmic sound resembling that of human talk heard indistinctly. This led me to try fitting a diaphragm to the machine, which would receive the vibrations or sound-waves made by my voice when I talked to it, and register these vibrations upon an impressible material placed on the cylinder. The material selected for immediate use was paraffined paper, and the results obtained were excellent. The indentations on the cylinder, when rapidly revolved, caused a repetition of the original vibrations to reach the ear through a recorder, just as if the machine itself were speaking. I saw at once that the problem of registering human speech, so that it could be repeated by mechanical means as often as might be desired, was solved.

The history of the phonograph as it was then devised and manufactured in small quantity, merely for purposes of public exhibition and explanation, need not be repeated here. The idea occurred to me in the spring of 1877, and, according as I could get leisure, I gave my attention to preparing the few exhibition machines which were placed before the public in 1878, and then universally recognized by scientific men and every one else as an absolute novelty. These machines, of course, exemplified only a small part of the capacity of the phonograph. I was hard at work describing and noting down the various parts of the machine as it would appear when perfected, and making drawings of them in various forms.

As it was impossible to drop my work and sit down to tell the public what I was doing every day, I noted briefly in my NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW article of May–June, 1878, some of the things which I proposed to accomplish. The details of the electric light and other inventions afterwards absorbed much of my time and attention. My laboratory was converted into a factory in order to supply the demand for the electric light, and my progress in carrying out my ideas about the phonograph, though continuous, was necessarily retarded. For months past, however, I have had a special factory in operation, producing the component parts of the perfected phonograph, so as to bring the machine within the reach of the public in the form which I originally designed it to take.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be of interest, here, to contrast briefly the perfected phonograph with the mere exhibition models shown, all over the world, in 1878. Those models were large, heavy machines which purposely sacrificed distinctness of articulation, in order to secure a loud tone which could be heard in a large room when emitted through a funnel-shaped transmitter. Tin-foil was used as the material on which the indentations were to be made. The cylinders were revolved by hand, or by clock-work; and there were numerous other details of construction which differed from those of the instrument as now completed. At that time I had made various designs for a special kind of electric motor, differing from all others, to run the machine, in place of clock-work; and the phonograph as we now manufacture it is provided with such a motor, which turns the cylinder noiselessly, uniformly and easily. Instead of tin-foil, I now use a cylinder of wax for receiving the record of sound-pulsations, as in the original experiment. One diaphragm (the "recorder") receives these pulsations, which are incised on the wax, in exceedingly fine lines, hardly visible to the naked eye, by means of a small point pressing against the wax. A turning tool attachment, near this recording diaphragm pares off the surface of the wax, removing any record which may previously have been left there, and smoothing the way for whatever you wish to speak into the "recorder." When you have finished speaking, two simple motions bring the reproducing diaphragm into place directly over the wax; and this diaphragm, provided with a very delicate but durable needle, takes up and reproduces the vibrations registered in the fine lines of indentation, bringing them to the ear by means of a tube. Sometimes, indeed, one can hear the recorded words as they are thrown off by the needle from the revolving cylinder, without using a tube at all, and simply by putting the ear close to the wax. The adjustments of these receiving and transmitting diaphragms, known as the "recorder" and the "reproducer," are very exact, but very easily arranged. And a machine, once adjusted after being set up, will run well with very little attention or readjustment, for a long period of time. The battery, also, conveniently placed in a box under the desk which holds the instrument, will last for six weeks or more, according to use, without renewal. A scale and indicator running the whole length of the cylinder, in front, enable you to observe at what point you began talking, so that the reproducer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be set at that point on the wax as soon as you wish to take off the record. Another very handy attachment supplies a key for suspending the reproduction of sounds when it is going on too rapidly for the copyist who is writing it out. A second key, when pressed down, will run the reproducer back so as to repeat anything which has not been clearly understood, and this may be done any desired number of times.

A single wax cylinder, or blank, may be used for fifteen or twenty successive records before it is worn out. But if the record is to be kept, the wax blank must not be talked upon again, and is simply slipped off from the metal cylinder and filed away for future reference. It may be fitted on to the cylinder again at any time, and will at once utter whatever has been registered on it. One of these wax blanks will repeat its contents thousands of times with undiminished clearness. Further, we are able to multiply to any extent, at slight cost, phonographic copies of the blank, after the talking, or music, or other sounds have been put upon it once.

It is curious to reflect that the Assyrians and Babylonians, 2,500 years ago, chose baked clay cylinders inscribed with cuneiform characters, as their medium for perpetuating records; while this recent result of modern science, the phonograph, uses cylinders of wax for a similar purpose, but with the great and progressive difference that our wax cylinders speak for themselves, and will not have to wait dumbly for centuries to be deciphered, like the famous Kileh-Shergat cylinder, by a Rawlinson or a Layard. With our facilities, a sovereign, a statesman, or a historian, can inscribe his words on a phonograph blank, which will then be multiplied a thousand-fold; each multiple copy will repeat the sounds of his voice thousands of times; and so, by reserving the copies and using them in relays, his utterance can be transmitted to posterity, centuries afterwards, as freshly and forcibly as if those later generations heard his living accents. Instrumental and vocal music—solos, duets, quartets, quintets, etc.—can be recorded on the perfected phonograph with startling completeness and precision. How interesting it will be to future generations to learn from the phonograph exactly how Rubinstein played a composition on the piano; and what a priceless possession it would have been to us, could we have Gen. Grant's memorable words, "Let us have peace," inscribed on the phonograph for perpetual reproduction in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his own intonations! We are in a position to obtain results of this sort, by the present phonograph, from the wave-motions of sound; so that it seems to me we realize here the "poetry of motion" in a new sense, combined with the *science* of motion.

In my article ten years ago, I enumerated among the uses to which the phonograph would be applied: 1. Letter writing and all kinds of dictation without the aid of a stenographer. 2. Phonographic books, which would speak to blind peop'e without effort on their part. 3. The teaching of elocution. 4. Reproduction of music. 5. The "Family Record"—a registry of sayings, reminiscences, etc., by members of a family, in their own voices, and of the last words of dying persons. 6. Music boxes and toys. 7. Clocks that should announce in articulate speech the time for going home, going to meals, etc. 8. The preservation of languages, by exact reproduction of the manner of pronouncing. 9. Educational purposes; such as preserving the explanations made by a teacher, so that the pupil can refer to them at any moment, and spelling or other lessons placed upon the phonograph for convenience in committing to memory. 10. Connection with the telephone, so as to make that invention an auxiliary in the transmission of permanent and invaluable records, instead of being the recipient of momentary and fleeting communications.

Every one of these uses the perfected phonograph is now ready to carry out. I may add that, through the facility with which it stores up and reproduces music of all sorts, or whistling and recitations, it can be employed to furnish constant amusement to invalids, or to social assemblies, at receptions, dinners, etc. Any one sitting in his room alone may order an assorted supply of wax cylinders inscribed with songs, poems, piano or violin music, short stories, anecdotes, or dialect pieces, and, by putting them on his phonograph, he can listen to them as originally sung or recited by authors, vocalists and actors, or elocutionists. The variety of entertainment he thus commands, at trifling expense and without moving from his chair, is practically unlimited. Music by a band, in fact whole operas, can be stored up on the cylinders, and the voice of Patti singing in England can thus be heard again on this side the ocean, or preserved for future generations. On four cylinders eight inches long, with a diameter of five, I can put the whole of "Nicholas Nickleby" in phonogram

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form. In teaching the correct pronunciation of English, and especially of foreign languages, the phonograph as it stands seems to be beyond comparison, for no system of phonetic spelling can convey to the pupil the pronunciation of a good English, French, German or Spanish speaker so well as a machine that reproduces his utterance even more exactly than a human imitator could.

The speeches of orators, the discourses of clergymen, can be had "on tap," in every house that owns a phonograph. It would not be very surprising if, a few years hence, phonographic newspaper bulletins should be issued on wax cylinders. Even now, so soon as the phonograph comes into general use, newspaper reporters and correspondents can talk their matter into the phonograph, either in the editorial office or at some distant point, by a telephone wire connected with a phonograph in the composing-room, so that the communication may be set up in type without any preliminary of writing it out in long hand.

The wax cylinders can be sent through the mails in little boxes which I have had prepared for that purpose, and then put upon another phonograph at a distant point, to be listened to by a friend or business correspondent. To obviate the difficulty caused by the friend's not having a phonograph of his own, pay stations will be established, to which any one may take the phonogram that he has received, have it placed on the instrument, and the contents recited to him from the machine, as well as copied out at the same moment by a type-writer. Thus the phonograph will be at the service of every one who can command a few cents for the fee. And which of us would not rather pay something extra, in order to hear a dear friend's or relative's voice speaking to us from the other side of the earth?

Authors can register their fleeting ideas and brief notes on the phonograph at any hour of day or night, without waiting to find pen, ink or paper, and in much less time than it would take to write out even the shortest memoranda. They can also publish their novels or essays exclusively in phonogram fôrm, so as to talk to their readers personally; and in this way they can protect their works from being stolen by means of defective copyright laws. Musical composers, in improvising compositions, will be able to have them recorded instantaneously on the phonograph.

For the present it has been decided to make all the phonographs of uniform size; so that a record put upon the machine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in New York may be placed on another machine of the same pattern in China, and speak exactly as it was spoken to on this continent. Each wax blank will receive from 800 to 1,000 words; and of course several blanks may be used for one document, if needed. This uniform size and pattern make the thing perfectly practicable in offices which have business connections all over the globe. My private secretary to-day speaks all letters into a phonograph, from which they are taken off by a type-writer or ordinary long-hand writer, with an immense saving of time and trouble. Persons having a large correspondence can talk all their letters into the phonograph in a very short time, and leave them to be listened to and copied by an assistant, without the delay involved in stenography or the trouble of going over and correcting the copyist's work, which is almost inevitable under the conditions of dictation now prevailing.

Furthermore, two business men, conferring together, can talk into the recorder by means of a double transmitting tube, with perfect privacy, and yet obtain upon the cylinder an unimpeachable transcript of their conversation in their own voices, with every break and pause, every hesitation or confident affirmation, every partial suggestion or particular explanation, infallibly set down in the wax.

They can then have this conversation written out or typed by a secretary, for future reference; or can, if they prefer, have it multiple-copied by our mechanical process. In this way, many misunderstandings may be avoided. Interesting philosophic or literary discussions and dialogues may be recorded in the same way. In fact, the phonograph will do, and does at this moment accomplish, the same thing in respect of conversation which instantaneous photography does for moving objects; that is, it will present whatever it records with a minute accuracy unattained by any other means.

The most skillful observers, listeners and realistic novelists, or even stenographers, cannot reproduce a conversation exactly as it occurred. The account they give is more or less generalized. But the phonograph receives, and then transmits to our ears again, every least thing that was said—exactly *as* it was said—with the faultless fidelity of an instantaneous photograph. We shall now for the first time know what conversation really is; just as we have learned, only within a few years, through the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instantaneous photograph, what attitudes are taken by the horse in motion.

Letters of introduction may be spoken on to a phonograph blank, without any of the formality of address and phraseology now customary, or the trouble of folding, enveloping and addressing a written communication. In fact all correspondence will be greatly simplified and wisely abbreviated by the use of phonograms. A telephone subscriber can place at his telephone a phonogram which will announce to the exchange, whenever he is called up, that he has left the office and will return at a certain time. Similarly, one man calling at the office of another and not finding him, will talk into the phonograph anything he wishes to say. This saves the trouble of writing a note, and obviates the uncertainty of giving to clerk, office boy or servant an oral message that may be forgotten or incorrectly delivered. Hotels and clubs will, naturally, find this function of the phonograph extremely serviceable; and their guests, or patrons, will avail themselves of phonograms constantly. The accuracy of interviews with newspaper reporters will also be determined, no doubt, by phonographic record. And travelers in vestibule trains will be glad to use phonograph blanks in place of letter paper and telegraph blanks, owing to the difficulty of writing while on a rapidly moving train.

It must be borne in mind that I am not talking now of things which may be made possible in the future. I did my predicting ten years ago; and the functions above mentioned are those which the present perfected phonograph is able to fulfill at this moment. To use the phonograph, a little instruction and practice are needed, but much less than the type-writer requires and hardly more than the training needed for the operation of a sewing-machine.

Various other uses for which the phonograph is now fully ripe might be mentioned; but I do not want to give to these memoranda the character of a catalogue. Enough has been said, I think, to indicate that the phonograph, unlike children, should be "seen" *and* "heard." It is no longer in a state of infancy. It may be still in its childhood; but it is destined to a vigorous maturity. The phonograph, in one sense, knows more than we do ourselves. For it will retain a perfect mechanical memory of many things which we may forget, even though we have said

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. It will become an important factor in education; and it will teach us to be careful what we say—for it imparts to us the gift of hearing ourselves as others hear us—exerting thus a decidedly moral influence by making men brief, businesslike and straightforward, cultivating improved manners, and uniting distant friends and associates by direct vocal communication.

THOMAS A. EDISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FETICHISM IN THE CAMPAIGN.

THE alleged election of Grover Cleveland to the Presidency in 1884 was the most astounding phenomenon in American politics, and it is doubtful whether its parallel can be found in the history of any nation. Obscure men, ignorant men, degraded men, have been elevated to power, but it has never before occurred that a man possessing every acknowledged disqualification has been selected because of them, and elevated from the lowest to the highest estate without ever having expressed a recorded opinion upon any public question. It is not known that he ever made a political speech, tried an important cause, was a member of any legislative body, wrote a remembered paragraph, or expressed an intelligent idea, and after three years of administration his political views, if he has any, are a matter of surmise even to his partisans. It remains uncertain to this hour whether his predilections in the war for the Union were with the North or the South, and except that he furnished a substitute when conscripted, whom he subsequently permitted to die in the poor-house, it is certain that he sustained no personal relation, either in sentiment or deed, to the most momentous controversy of modern times. He has no perceptible connection with the category of accidents to which his elevation is due. He had neither personal following, popularity, admiration nor respect, because he had exhibited none of the traits nor attainments that inspire regard. He was not eloquent, nor learned, nor cultivated, nor agreeable, nor entertaining, nor attractive in mind, manner or person. His enjoyments were those which are found in the unrestrained indulgence of the appetites and passions, and his chosen associates were the companions of his orgies.

From this inert and vacant mass the transcendentalists and Pharisees of our politics have made unto themselves a graven image, to which they bow down and worship with ignominious idol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

atry and self abasement. They declare that he possesses the courage of Jackson, though the first threat of public exasperation, like that aroused by the battle-flag order, drives him to retraction, and to the imputation of unpopular acts to the indiscretion of subordinates. His tedious platitudes are described as wisdom, and his dull self-complacency as imperturbable poise and resolution. His wearisome protestations of purity, and of antagonism to the corrupt and malignant influences of his party associates, are announced as evidences of official integrity, which justify his assumptions of superior honesty, and warrant him in perpetually impugning the motives of mankind. He regards as enemies all who are unable to concur with his swollen estimate of his superlative preëminence, and manifests resentment toward all opponents, whether in his own party or elsewhere. Having cheated the "Reformers" and bullied the renegades in the North, he truckles to his masters in the South, acknowledges his hypocrisy, admits his treachery, and, not disconcerted by exposure, demands another term in the face of his plain avowal that he would not ask for a renomination. Devoid alike of imagination and of conscience, he appeals neither to the sentiment nor to the moral sense of the people. Attention will not be diverted, therefore, from the real issues of the campaign by considerations personal to Cleveland. He will be nominated, not as a leader but as a fetich—a thing endowed by superstition and ignorance with fictitious attributes. There will be no hero-worship. It is impossible to excite popular enthusiasm for an executive who confessedly reaches the climax of his great powers in refusing to approve an appropriation for a public building in a country town, and vetoing with ghoulish glee a two-dollar pension bill for a mutilated and disabled Union veteran.

Paradoxical as it may appear, the administration of Cleveland has resulted in inestimable advantage to the people of the United States. It has furnished additional evidence, if such were necessary, of their capacity for self-government. There is no longer occasion to despair of the perpetuity of the Republic.

Politically, it has established beyond controversy, as one of the issues of the campaign, the falsity of the accusations upon which the Republican party was defeated in 1884. So constant had been the assertions of Democratic orators for a generation that Republican administration had been extravagant and dishon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

est, and its civil service corrupt, that many good men felt an uneasy suspicion that the ledgers had been tampered with, and unworthy favorites retained in office to conceal guilty secrets from the public. The fulfillment of the promise to "open the books" and "turn the rascals out" was anticipated with exultation by some and with anxiety by many; but the result has disappointed both. Under the hostile scrutiny of three years no Republican official has been removed for cause, neither error nor defalcation has been detected in the enormous financial transactions of a quarter of a century, and departure from Republican methods of administration, whenever attempted, has resulted only in loss, confusion, and public disapproval. These charges cannot be repeated. They have been disproved and definitely abandoned.

The Democracy were entrusted with power upon a pledge of economy and reform in the administration of the Government. Reform implies that there is something which needs reformation, and the electors have the right to inquire whether this pledge has been kept or violated. It will be one of the most important issues of the campaign, and the evidence is conclusive and overwhelming that since the days of Jackson there has been no such shameless and dissolute prostitution of the public service to personal and partisan uses as that which has occurred under this new dispensation of purity, sweetness and light, which was supposed to usher in the political millenium. The degradation is complete. Even the pretence of virtue has been dropped, and the unhappy victims of the mock-marriage are treated with unfeeling derision and neglect. Every department of the Government has been transformed into a party machine. Efficient and experienced subordinates have been displaced by incompetent and untrained men for political reasons only, in the mail service, in the Indian Bureau, in the Land Department, till the public business has fallen into imbecile and inextricable disorder. The expenses of the Government, meanwhile, have been greatly increased. An appearance of "economy" has been secured by inadequate appropriations, supplemented by deficiency bills, or by the refusal to pay the acknowledged and ascertained obligations of the Treasury. The Courts of the United States in many districts have been closed, and justice denied for want of funds to pay jurors and witnesses. The spirit, and even the letter of the Civil Service act have been violated to secure partisan results, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Commission have amended the statute requiring preference to be given to Union soldiers by adding a provision that they shall not be above forty years of age. As the war closed twenty-three years ago, this regulation renders any soldier ineligible who was more than seventeen years old when it ended. And thus excludes the great mass of veterans for whose benefit the law was enacted.

Upon the questions affecting the revenues and the resources of the nation, an issue of still greater consequence and importance will be presented for the decision of the people in November. The Democratic party distinctly promised to reduce and distribute the surplus in the Treasury; to readjust the tariff; to provide against the threatened contraction of the currency through the approaching extinction of the public debt. They have had three years of power, and have not only done nothing, but have proposed nothing. The surplus has reached the highest amount known in our history. The President first exerted an admitted power to use it in the purchase of bonds, and then with suspicious inconsistency refused to exercise it, upon the shallow pretext that his authority was uncertain. He issued an ante-nuptial proclamation to Congress upon silver, which his party in the House of Representatives treated with disdainful indifference. His message upon the tariff was a covert appeal for free trade that was received by every enemy of the United States with unconcealed satisfaction. As a contribution to the literature of the subject, it was respectable only from the antiquity of the débris industriously collected from the rubbish heaps of political economy, and paraded with the conscious pride of the discoverer of a new planet in the realms of space.

One of the most profound and pervading impulses of the American character is an intense pride in citizenship, and in the institutions and the honor of the nation. The democratic party will be called upon to render an account of its stewardship in dealing with foreign powers. It is an unparalleled record of sycophancy and imbecility. No one can read its annals without humilation, shame and indignation. The fiasco in Mexico, the surrender to England, the disgraceful exhibitions of boorishness and ignorance at other courts, form a chapter of ignominy that fittingly supplements the policy of selecting as diplomatic representatives of the government those who had only signalized themselves by efforts for its destruction.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Canadian fisheries dispute the Senate refused to authorize further negotiation; but in defiance of law, and without warrant under the Constitution, the President appointed Commissioners and consented to an arrangement which is heralded by the other powers as a concession by the United States of all the principal matters in controversy, and which impose conditions upon American citizens to which they cannot submit without degradation and dishonor.

The generation of young men, born since the close of the war, will participate this year for the first time in a presidential election. Their votes will determine the result. To them the war of the Rebellion is as much a matter of history as the war of Independence. They must be instructed, and one of the issues of the campaign will be to teach them which of the two great parties is entitled to their confidence as patriotic citizens. The Democracy have been endeavoring insidiously to obliterate their own record and to reverse the verdict of posterity, by claiming that they supported the Union cause in the supreme crisis of the national life, and are therefore worthy of the suffrages of the youth of the United States. It is an insolently false pretence. The great majority of the Democratic party is composed of the men who attempted to destroy the Union and the Constitution, reinforced, now as then, by a Northern contingent of renegades and apostates who are ready to barter their birthright of manhood and freedom for the pottage of place and power.

But the issue that exceeds all others in importance is suffrage in the South. There are 153 votes in the Electoral College assured to the Democratic party without any other effort than that required to write the certificates of election. Forty-eight more in the North will give Cleveland another term, during which the Supreme Court will be reconstructed upon the basis of hostility to the constitutional amendments and the statutes of freedom. Not only among the white politicians, but among the white voters of the South, there is a settled and avowed determination to eliminate the negro as an element in the political problem, and to suppress his vote. In the language of the Senator from Louisiana, the negroes are to be "persuaded" to abstain from voting! There is no longer any disguise or concealment of this purpose. They are citizens entitled to vote, and generally Republican in politics, and in several States are the majority; but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the election machinery being in the hands of the Democracy, they are either excluded from the polls, or their votes are suppressed and destroyed. The election in Louisiana April 17 is an illustration of the methods employed. The State is undoubtedly Republican, and Warmoth was unquestionably the choice of a majority of the electors. The Governor publicly pledged himself to an honest election, admitting that frauds had been committed in the past which should not be repeated. Relying upon these assurances, the Republicans organized, and entered upon the canvass. The Governor, becoming terrified at the prospect of defeat, issued orders to fabricate and manufacture Democratic majorities, and the result was a spurious majority so astounding that the only reply that Senator Eustis could make was, "It is none of your business!" That is to say, by the suppression of majorities, by ballot box stuffing, by forging certificates of election, a President may be chosen, senators and representatives elected, who are to decide every question affecting the tariff, the revenues, the currency, our relations foreign and domestic, the taxes of every citizen, and guide and control the destiny of the nation for the coming century, and it is none of our business! If such methods are to prevail, then constitutional self-government is at an end upon this continent. Dahomey and Zululand are no worse.

The South obtained thirty-eight additional members of Congress by the enfranchisement of the negro. If they wish to deny him the right of suffrage, justice and honor demand that they shall relinquish the increment, so that the equality of suffrage may be restored and the equilibrium between the North and the South maintained.

This then is the paramount issue, surpassing every other; before which tariffs, taxes, currency and surplus shrink and dwindle into nothingness: impartial justice and the equality of all men before the law.

"Of what avail
Are plough and sail,
Or life, or land, if freedom fail?"

JOHN J. INGALLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MATTHEW ARNOLD AS A POET.

THE poetry of Matthew Arnold differs from the poetry of all the later English poets in several important particulars, and this differentiation, while it closed against him the doors of contemporary popularity, opened before him the shining portal of permanent fame. When he is at his best, his poetry is so good—not merely in the kind that it illustrates, but in every kind—so luminous, so lovely, so noble, that one cannot but regret there is not more of it. There is nothing that he might not have done, we think, if only he could have devoted his life to poetry, instead of being devoted by it to the *res augusta domi*. If he could have followed his bent, unhindered by the necessities of bread-winning, he might have stood abreast with Tennyson and Browning, instead of behind them, as he did, after gaining his first poetic triumphs.

Arnold did not rush into verse lightly, for he was twenty-six when his first volume, "The Strayed Reveller and Other Poems," was published. Nor boldly, for he concealed his identity under the signature of "A." Precisely what this collection contained, and by what qualities it was characterized, it is not easy to determine, since the chronological order of Arnold's verse has been disturbed by its arrangement under different classes in the later editions; but judging from the leading poem it was distinguished by a classical spirit which had been absent from English poetry since the days of Milton, and which could be thoroughly appreciated only by those who were imbued with classical scholarship in its purest form. This spirit is supposed by most unlettered readers to be dominant in the poetry of Keats, but scholars know better; for "Endymion," though a charming poem of a careless Elizabethan sort, is not Greek, except, perhaps, in the Hymn to Pan. Nor is the art of "Hyperion" Greek, but Gothic, though Gothic of the severest order. The only living poets from whom Arnold could have learned anything classical were Landor and Tennyson, with whose "Hellenica" and "Ænone" he was no doubt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

familiar, though there is no trace of any such familiarity in his verse. The inspiration of "The Strayed Reveller" was drawn from no modern source, from no trickling rills in the gardens of English poetry—but from the fresh springs and lucent fountains of old Greek song. The chief excellence of this poem, apart from the classical feeling which was the motive of its composition, is a curious suggestiveness wherein everything is seen as in a mirror, and nothing is reproduced as in a painting, a power of conveying picturesque impressions without description, and of conveying only what is most essential in these, the subtle hints of color and the delicate touches of light and shade which authenticate nature in its translation into art. If we may judge from his practice, "word-painting," that brilliant but meretricious mannerism of so much recent verse, was Arnold's abomination. The visions of antique life which come and go before the dazed eyes of the strayed reveller, drunken with the magic wine of Circe, have no parallel in English poetry, unless it be in the shifting groups on the glorious Grecian Urn, which Keats has celebrated in his deathless Ode. Both are classic, but with the difference that separates sculpture from painting, the chisel of Phidias from the pencil of Apelles. "The Strayed Reveller" is in a pure but not in a high style of Greek, and being at most but a lyrical venture therein. It was an experiment, in that the form into which it was molded suggested rhyme, which was avoided in accordance, of course, with the laws of classical verse, to which Arnold was committed, and which he was determined to maintain here at all hazards. The question of unrhymed measures in English poetry, outside of its crowning glory, blank verse, is too large a one to be entered upon in these pages. But one thing is certain, and that is that no poet, great or small, has ever yet succeeded in so writing them as to make them satisfactory to English ears, and so naturalizing them in the language. Arnold would not admit this fact, then or later, and his violation of it has diminished the charm of some of his most exquisite poems.

Arnold's next volume, "Empedocles on Etna," was wrought under classical influences which necessitated a darker conception and a larger handling than "The Strayed Reveller." The Sicilian Greek whom he chose for his hero belonged to the same class of unhappy mortals as Hamlet, Faust and Manfred, of whom he was the poetic forerunner. A philosopher whose philosophy had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forsaken him, a worshiper of gods concerning whose existence he was skeptical, sick of himself, whom he pitied not, and of mankind, whom he pitied much, discontented, despairing, desperate, oppressed, maddened, overwhelmed with his intolerable burden, the insoluble riddle of the world, the impenetrable mystery of life and death,—such was the hero of this soul's tragedy of Arnold's. Nothing in earlier English poetry with which we are acquainted could have suggested the form of "Empedocles on Etna," which is rather romantic than classical, consisting of a framework of blank verse, interspersed with rhymed passages, and consisting of what may be called a lyrical interlude which Empedocles is supposed to speak in the highest skirts of the woody region of Etna, while he accompanies himself in a solemn manner on his harp. We have here the first specimen of Arnold's blank verse, which is noticeable for precision as well as ease; fluent, yet compact, melodious and harmonious, but without the individuality it was soon to attain. It is tentative, not distinctive. The lyric upon which so much depends, in that it is meant to disclose and declare, to embody and express, the whirl and stress of the spiritual agonies which are sweeping the wretched philosopher to destruction, chasing each other through his darkened mind like the shadows of a rack of thunder clouds,—this long-drawn lyric, which occupies some eighteen or twenty pages, is confused and ineffective. It measured the limitation of Arnold, who was not a lyrical poet, in the sense that Coleridge and Shelley were, and Byron in the Thyrza poems. His ear failed to detect their illusive secrets of melody.

But there are graver defects in this poem than are implied in technical deficiencies or a faulty structure. There is the fatal defect which inheres in the personality of Empedocles himself, and in the situation in which he is placed,—one of those situations in which the suffering finds no vent in action, in which a continuous state of mental distress is prolonged, unrelieved by incident, hope, or resistance, in which there is everthing to be endured, nothing to be done. "In such situations there is inevitably something morbid, in the description of them something monotonous. When they occur in actual life, they are painful, not tragic; the representation of them in poetry is painful also." Speedily condemned by Arnold himself, for the reasons just stated, "Empedocles on Etna" was excluded from his next collection of verse.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arnold's third volume—the first collected edition of his Poems, as the two volumes published by Tennyson twelve years before were the first collected edition of his Poems—consisted, like the collection of the elder poet, of selections from his earlier productions, ballasted and freighted with what he had since written in the shape of verse. That the scope of his intellectual vision had been enlarged, and his powers matured, was evident on every page. Actuated in the beginning by classical impulses, the spirit in his feet had led him into broader realms of song, the mediæval kingdom of womanly affection which builded the Church of Brow, the legendary empire of tumultuous passion of which Tristram and Iseult were the victims, the world of heroic actions where Sohrab and Rustem engaged in that desperate duel, which, end as it might, would break the heart of the victor. Given as a starting point what is known, or imagined, respecting any particular period, classic, romantic, realistic, and what is known, or imagined, respecting the personages who figured therein, in history or legend, the first business of the poet who purposes to exercise his talents upon the facts or fancies thereof, is critical, not poetical. He must discover the spirit of that period and the individuality of its personages, and these once discovered, and mastered, must be kept constantly before him. Before writing "Tristram and Iseult" Arnold had to settle his conviction with regard to the poetic impression it ought to produce, and settle at the same time the method by which this impression should be created. What qualities distinguished the romances of chivalry of which the story of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table was the most notable example? Tennyson was the first modern poet who sought to solve the Arthurian problem, and in solving it to revive the spirit of chivalrous romance. Beginning with "The Lady of Shallott," continuing with "Morte d'Arthur," and ending with the "Joyes of the King," he has devoted more than half his life to this enchanting subject. That his poetic renderings thereof are beautiful is certain; that they are faithful is not so certain, as the readers of Sir Thomas Malory have long known, and the readers of Arnold and Browning also. He has missed the significance of the old legends which he has summoned from their centuried sleep, and to which he has imparted a life that is not their own, and in missing it he has shown the limitation of his critical and poetical powers. What this significance is is felt

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the readers of Browning's "Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came" and Arnold's "Tristram and Iseult," which transport us to another world than our own, remote, unfamiliar, surrounded with alien influences, peopled with visionary shapes, haunted with mysterious shadows, the world of fantasy and dream, glorious with life, and ruinous with death. The difference between Tennyson and Arnold in their treatment of chivalrous subjects is the difference between a well lighted parlor whose walls are hung with choice pictures and the darkened chamber of an old castle whose walls are hung with rude arras.

The critical judgment which directed Arnold in this creation of romantic art directed him in the larger art that created "Sohrab and Rustem." The episode which it embodies is one of the noblest that ever fed the imagination and fixed the soul of a poet. It is one of those great human actions that appeal to the great human affections, to those elemental feelings which subsist permanently in the race, and which are independent of time and place. He selected the most touching situation in the national epic of Firdousi, and recast it in English verse without sacrificing its Persian spirit. He reproduced his original with scholarly as well as poetic fidelity. To those who can read the recital of heroic actions without emotion it is nought; but to those who are capable of being moved with feeling and passion—the pathetic and tragic elements of life—it is the noblest poem in the world. It fulfills the old definition of tragedy, in that it awakens pity and terror, and it fulfills the highest definition of poetry, in that it is admirably planned, orderly in its development, transparently clear and vividly picturesque, manly, majestic, dignified, and, more than all, vital with human interest. Written in the grand style of Homer, there is a distinction in it which no other English narrative poem possesses.

Other influences than those of Persian history and chivalrous story were manifested in this third collection of Arnold's verse, and among them may be mentioned that of Wordsworth, whose manner was marked in "Mycerinus," which was pitched in the same key as "Laodamia," and that of Keats, the manner of whose Odes was marked in "The Scholar Gipsy." The train of thought which runs through "Mycerinus" is one which the contemplation of life forces upon all serious minds. It concerns itself with the insignificance of human actions in the large order of the uni-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

verse, and the indifference with which they are regarded by the higher powers, who, superior to man in intelligence, are inferior to man in the sense of justice. It is the old, old riddle of the earth, and it is as insoluble now as when the young Egyptian king brooded over it in the luminous shadow of his palm groves along the mysterious Nile. Whether Arnold would have written "The Scholar Gipsy" if Keats had not written his "Ode to a Nightingale" may be doubted. It is true that he might have written a poem about the poor Oxford scholar, concerning whom Glanvil wrote two hundred years before, but it would not have been the same poem that he did write, so absolute throughout is the inspiration of Keats. In no sense an imitation, for poets like Arnold do not imitate, it is a reproduction of the pastoral element which Keats introduced into English verse—the light, consummate flower of his glorious seed, and as such as distinctive of Arnold as of Keats, who might have bequeathed it to his unborn successor, when on that dark February morning in Rome he closed his wearied eyes in their last slumber. The charm of a poem like "The Scholar Gipsy," or a poem like "Thyrsis," which is a graver rendering of the same general effect, is indescribable—so many and so diverse poetical qualities are interfused therein. Primarily a pastoral, in that it is filled with glimpses of English rural scenery, which, beautiful everywhere, are exquisite in the neighborhood of Oxford, it is more than a pastoral, in that it is flooded with personal feelings, which flow from the loveliness of nature as it steals into the mind of the poet, or from the mind of the poet as it casts the lights and shadows of its moods over this loveliness. "The Scholar Gipsy" is a vision of the perfect landscapes of England; and "Thyrsis," with its sad sincerity and its manly reticence of sorrow, is worthy of the pen that wrote "Adonais," or the greater pen that wrote "Lycidas."

The meditative poetry of Arnold has been variously estimated by those who accept and those who reject meditative poetry. It was the natural, the inevitable outgrowth of one who had known the spiritual unrest of his period, and who, while he was crushed, was wounded by it. It is melancholy, but not misanthropical; not consolatory, perhaps, but certainly not cynical. It is profoundly serious, its morality is of the highest, and one feels in reading it that the poet was greater than his poetry.

R. H. STODDARD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARE FAST OR SLOW STEAMERS THE SAFEST?

It seems not unlikely that within a year the fastest steamers now on the Atlantic, such as the "Umbria" and the "Eturia," will cease to hold their pre-eminence in the matter of speed, and that the time of the passage between New York and Queenstown will be reduced by at least twenty-four hours, making it just one-half what it was when the old "Scotia" represented the minimum. The quickest passage on record now is a little over six days, and we have the authority of the most successful of modern shipbuilders for saying that the only question whether this can be surpassed or not is the question of expense; that there are no natural or scientific obstacles to still more wonderful achievements; and that the chief thing which shipbuilders and shipowners have to consider is whether a higher rate of speed will be profitable. Meanwhile, many passengers who cross the ocean, glad as they may be to curtail the tedium and distress which are so often inseparable from the most luxurious and expeditious navigation, look with no little misgiving on the velocity of those so-called "ocean greyhounds," and are yet more apprehensive of proposed attempts to accelerate them. To make the passage in six days a steamer has to maintain, day after day, night after night, without break or intermission, a speed little lower than the average of the express trains which run between the East and the Pacific. Does not this expose her to imminent peril from collision and in approaching the coast? Does it not deprive her of any chance of avoiding an obstacle in her path? The partial knowledge of the subject possessed by landsmen disposes them to look upon slow steamers as the safest, and the tortoise and the hare again start out to adorn the debate. The ill-fated "Oregon," of the Cunard line, is remembered. Would that splendid ship have been lost as she was had it not been for the extraordinary speed at which she was traveling? The commanders of the principal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steamers on the Atlantic are almost unanimously in favor of fast ships, however, as the following replies to a question addressed to a number of them show:

"After an experience of 585 passages across the Atlantic, I am decidedly in favor of fast steamers, both on account of their safety and comfort, and I will as briefly as possible give my reasons.

"First, if you have a danger to encounter, the sooner you get over it the better, and if one steamer takes seven and another ten days to cross the Atlantic, it is evident that you have three more days of risk in the slower ship.

"Secondly, a fast steamer will run through a gale of wind and reach fine weather much quicker than a slow one, and the same holds good in regard to banks of fog. Unless there is ice in the vicinity, I always maintain that it is the safest plan to run through a fog bank as speedily as you can.

"Thirdly, if a collision takes place between two vessels, you may depend upon it that the one going fastest will sustain the least damage."

SAMUEL BROOKS,
Commander of the Guion Line Steamer "Arizona."

"I, for one, would not like to say, after my forty years' experience, which is the safer. There can be no question that the less time on the voyage the less risk. In event of a collision between a slow steamer and a fast one, I should prefer to be on the fast one; but in the event of striking ice, rocks, or a sand bank, I say take the slow one, and the slower the ship the better."

HAMILTON PERRY,
Late Commander White Star Line Steamer "Britannic."

"In my mind there is no question as to the greater safety of a fast and powerful steamer over a slow one. In cases of necessity, such as fog on the coast or ice in the ice track, you can reduce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the speed of the fast ship to any degree. In all other cases high speed and power are sources of safety. For instance, if in making a passage you are warned by a rapidly falling barometer and the veering of the wind that you are approaching unpleasantly near the vortex of a revolving storm, you can quickly run a fast ship into the outer circle and in many cases what might otherwise prove to be a disastrous gale may be transformed into a fair wind. Again, should you be caught in a heavy gale without due warning, the great power of the fast ship renders her a much superior sea boat, inasmuch as with a judicious use of that power you are enabled to keep your ship in the most favorable position all the time, while a ship of small power would be continually falling off and bringing the sea abeam, rendering herself liable to suffer damage about the decks as she came to the wind again. In support of this statement I may mention that I have been for some years in command of the 'Alaska,' during which period I have experienced the heaviest kind of weather, not excluding the late blizzard of March 12th, and yet I have never suffered the slightest damage about the decks, boats, rails, etc.

"In ordinary storms a fast ship will get through the bad weather in half the time a slow one will, and in dull, cloudy weather, such as one meets at certain seasons of the year for days together without sun, moon, or stars, a fast ship from her greater speed will be able to make safer and more direct courses than the slow one. In making land you are often able to save your daylight by a fast ship, and in making port you may save the tide and enter when a slow ship would have to anchor outside and face all the contingencies that might arise in that period. I quote these instances to show why I am so fully convinced in my own mind that the fast ship is so much safer than the slow one, and that in the former the risk is minimized to passengers, crews, owners, and underwriters."

GEORGE MURRAY,
Commander Guion Line Steamer "Alaska."

"I am of the opinion that the fast steamer is the safest. Wherever there is danger the sooner you are out of it the better. By exercising care in foggy weather, and slowing down to a moderate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speed, you have the same degree of safety as a slow ship, and a great advantage over her when it clears. On the other hand, we are more exposed, making two passages for a slow ship's one. But taking the two making the same voyage, the fast ship has decidedly the advantage."

WILLIAM MCMICKAN,
Commander Cunard Steamer "Umbria."

"Speed on the Atlantic, or, indeed, on any sea, is a much-vexed question, and you have so many conflicting statements on the subject that those who have had no experience find it hard to reconcile the various opinions. According to my judgment, a steamer of great speed is safer than one of small power.

"First, in case of bad weather, fast ships can keep head up to the wind and sea, and so be in the best and safest position for meeting the high waves we so often encounter during the heavy gales on the Atlantic. Their speed can always be regulated according to the height of the waves and the severity of the storm. It is also to be said of fast ships that they are a shorter time at sea, and the dangers of the ocean are of less duration with them than with the slow ships. Ships of very moderate and small power are never so safe as their faster sisters in bad weather. For example, a steamer that goes nine knots in fine weather would find it hard to keep her head up to the gale in boisterous weather, especially if she were lightly loaded, and would be in danger of falling into the trough. A fast ship is also better going before the gale, as there is little chance of her being pooped, that is, swamped by a following sea."

ARTHUR W. LEWIS,
Commander Inman Line Steamer "City of Chester."

"Strength and stability being equal, the fast steamer has a great advantage over her slow neighbor in many ways; but the handling and sailing of fast vessels require not only considerable training but a constitutional aptitude, so to speak, for that special work."

HORATIO MCKAY,
Commander Cunard Steamer "Servia."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"In March, 1871, when the steamers of the White Star Line first started, they were looked upon as vessels altogether faster than safety demanded, and many people predicted that the line would soon come to an end through disasters caused by collisions. They have now been running seventeen years and show a record second to none for freedom from collision. When the 'Britannic' and 'Germanic' first came out they were looked upon as marvels of speed, and notwithstanding the success of previous ships on our line fears were entertained that such speed would be dangerous and that collisions would certainly occur. As time passed on and passage after passage was made with such precision that almost the hour of arrival could be accurately determined, and as no accident happened, the confidence of the public was gained, and travelers who suffered from that dreadful affliction, seasickness, were only too glad to take passage by them and thereby reduce their misery by twenty-four or thirty-six hours. Both ships are still running, and with the exception of the collision between the 'Britannic' and the 'Celtic' in May, 1887, they have been clear of accidents and are among the most successful ships afloat. I made one hundred and thirteen round voyages (two hundred and twenty-six passages) in command of the 'Germanic' in eleven years and six months, and during that time not one collision occured. Previous to taking her I commanded the 'Baltic' for nearly three years with the same result.

"Since the advent of the 'Britannic' and 'Germanic' the Cunard, Inman, Guion, French and North German Lloyd lines have all built ships superior in size and speed to the two former, and the eight and nine day passages of the White Star steamers have been reduced to six days and a half by the 'Etruria' and the 'Umbria' of the Cunard line. The French and North German Lloyds have reduced theirs from ten and eleven days to about seven, and without any serious disaster. These facts most clearly demonstrate to the traveling public the fact that the increase of speed in the passenger steamers of the present day has not caused an increase of danger, and that they are quite as safe as the slow steamers of the past.

"It is hardly necessary for me to say how important it is that fast ships should be commanded by competent men—men who are careful and watchful; for as the size and power of a steamer are increased, so ought to be the vigilance and responsibility of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

captain. His duties, while on board his ship, are endless, and considering the number of lives and the immense amount of valuable property intrusted to him, it is not to be wondered at that his countenance is stern, and his manner perhaps not as agreeable as it might be if he were at a dinner party. Passengers who call the captain 'Bear' should take these facts into consideration, and respect him accordingly.

"Although the speed of passenger steamers has been increased, very little has been done in providing them with suitable sound signals for use in foggy weather, however. Several different codes have been laid before the English Board of Trade and the admiralty, but although the necessity of such signals has been proved and strongly advocated by seafaring men, none has been adopted. The different steamship companies acknowledge the necessity of such signals, and would willingly use them as an additional factor in promoting the safety of their ships; but as the Board of Trade has made no move in that direction, it is useless to adopt them unless they can be enforced generally. The international rules are to-day (with the exception of one or two slight changes) the same as they were years ago, and when in a fog the only means a commander has of making known his approach to another vessel is the single blast of the steam whistle, which conveys no information regarding the course he is steering. The codes I allude to give certain blasts for each point of the compass, so that a vessel using one of them can indicate to an approaching vessel the course she is steering, thereby avoiding all danger of collision. If a code were adopted and made compulsory on board all steamers, the ocean voyage would be relieved of a peril much more serious than any arising from a high rate of speed. Had such a code been in use on board the 'Britannic' and the 'Celtic' the collision between those ships would never have occurred."

CHARLES W. KENNEDY,
Late Commander of the White Star Steamer "Germanic."

"My opinion is that while extremely fast ships lessen the duration of dangers, they augment the number of dangers."

C. FRANGEUL,
Commander French Line steamer "La Bourgogne."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Without entering into long comparisons between slow and fast steamers, I may say, briefly, that I think the fast steamer safer than the slow one. She is a shorter time on the ocean, and the chances of accident are thus diminished. The personal interest of the captain and officers in her is greatly enhanced."

TH. DE JOUSSELIM,
Commander French Line steamer "La Bretagne."

"The Board of Trade commanding and regulating most of our actions at sea, has come to the conclusion (no doubt gathered from the experience of many men) that a slow rate of speed is safest in foggy weather, and, therefore, I try as nearly as possible to carry out its idea, so as to escape unfavorable comments in case of an accident.

"When a ship is approaching land and sounding constantly, a low rate of speed is, no doubt, best, since, should you be in error it might prevent you from becoming a total wreck. Again when a ship is in the vicinity of ice floes and bergs a low rate of speed is advisable, as it also is when a thick gale or beam wind is blowing, preventing your whistle from being heard any distance ahead. But in an ordinary fog I argue that full speed is the safest, and my reasons are these: If you slow down the moment fog comes on the steam roars out of the escape pipes with such a noise that for some time you are in absolute danger, not being able to see or hear anything; if you reduce the steam gradually you take power off your ship and pressure off your whistle, and if you suddenly hear some sound ahead you can only turn to the right or left slowly or stop altogether, letting the other ship take her chances of clearing you. Again you cannot reverse full speed, as your steam is too low to move the engines quickly. Now, going full speed all is as still and as quite as the grave. Ears and good look-outs are ready for the least sound. The moment you hear a sound, up helm and bring the horn or whistle abaft your beam, which is comparatively a place of safety, and blow once or twice to the other steamer, indicating to him whether you have directed your own ship to the port or starboard.

"The greatest trouble I find in foggy weather is the dislike many commanders of the smaller steamers have to sounding their fog signals. Some say, 'O, you can see farther than you can hear.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Others say, 'O, the fog will clear down. So don't disturb the passengers.' Others, 'O, once in two minutes is quite often enough.' I maintain that a whistle should be religiously sounded at least every minute, and oftener if necessary, but never less."

FRANK S. LAND,
Commander Inman Line Steamer "City of Berlin."

The commander of a White Star steamer, who does not wish his name to be published, writes:

"As a matter of fact the whole question: 'Are fast or slow steamers the safest,' resolves itself into a question of fogs, for, due vigilance being always exercised by the commander and his officers, that is where the real danger lies. We hear of vessels such as the 'City of Brussels' being run down when stopped or at anchor, and we hear of other cases where serious calamity has been avoided, simply and solely by reason of the high speed of the meeting vessels. A fog is the most treacherous and dreaded of all the sailor's enemies.

"Again, what is to be done when instructions vary so much? According to the Government (Board of Trade) regulations, commanders are instructed to go slow in a fog, and yet another department of the Government (the Post-Office) comes forward offering a premium on fast passages. The mails are given to the steamers which make the shortest passages, be the weather fair or foul and the risks what they may; with such matters, of course, the Post-Office officials have nothing to do!"

Another commander in the White Star Line, who also wishes to be unknown, writes:

"Your question might be divided thus: Is it safer to go through fogs as quickly as possible, or by going slower and keeping your vessel more under control, as far as reducing her headway is concerned, are you less liable to accidents? I think it is generally acknowledged among seamen that the former is the wiser course, especially with large steamers supplied with steam steering gear, as the greater the speed the quicker the vessel will turn in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

answer to her helm. You must also remember that with a fast steamer you are a much shorter time in a region of fog than with a slow steamer.

"Indeed, to my mind there is quite as much danger going slow as going fast. Then as to approaching land at a high rate of speed: this is said to be dangerous; but since Sir William Thomson invented his patent sounding machine, soundings can be taken when a ship is going at any speed.

"The safety of steamers going at a great speed cannot be better demonstrated I believe than by a reference to the Holyhead and Dublin mail steamers. These are among the fastest vessels in the world, making a speed of nearly twenty knots, or twenty-two and a half miles per hour; but though they have to cross the track of all vessels bound up the Irish Sea accidents to them are almost unheard of. Passengers may always rest assured of their safety in a first-class, well regulated steamer, should she be going fast or slow, and may relieve their minds of all anxiety, confident that every precaution which skill and experience can suggest is being taken."

The opinions of some of the principal ship builders were also sought, and among the replies received was this from Messrs. James and George Thomson, the builders of some of the most celebrated of the Cunard ships and also of the two new Inman ships which are expected to "break the record:"

"In our opinion, if proper attention be given to the steering power of the ship, a fast ship, in the hands of an able commander, is more able to avoid collision than a slow ship. On account of the shorter time a fast ship is at sea, as well as the shorter time she is in the vicinity of another ship, she is less liable to be in danger of collision, and even when in danger we think she is more able to avoid it. But we would point out that the question of safety is not wholly dependent on avoiding collisions, and that if proper structural arrangements are made a ship may be as safe after a collision as before it. In reply to your question, however, we may say that the fastest ships on the Atlantic are the safest in our opinion."

JAMES AND GEORGE THOMSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps it is because the obvious is so apt to escape us that the point oftenest reiterated in these communications comes with an undue freshness of conviction to the landsman, *i. e.*, that dangers are usually in proportion to the length of time a ship is at sea, and that, therefore, a fast ship is safer than a slow one, because the period of her exposure is of briefer duration.

But though there is a remarkable unanimity of opinion in favor of fast ships, the reasons given for the preference are not always sound, nor do they in all cases accord with what one might desire in the interest of humanity. If, for instance, a fast ship runs out of an area of fog or storm sooner than a slow ship, is it not true that the superiority of speed which enables her to do this also allows her to reach another such area which would cease to exist, perhaps, before her tardier competitor could reach it. Let us say that the "Alaska" encounters a heavy gale on the banks on a Sunday, when she is in company with a slower ship. She has run out of it by Monday morning, while the other ship has to struggle through it several hours longer. On the following Wednesday the "Alaska" meets another gale, and has to bear all the force of it, but by the time the slow ship reaches it, it has moderated or blown itself out. Possibly it may be said in answer to this that still another storm might overtake the laggard, which the fast ship being so many miles ahead would be able to avoid; but chances of this kind do not afford any secure basis for a positive assertion. Again, though it may be a selfish, not to say inhuman consideration, it is undeniably comforting to the passenger by a fast steamer to be assured that in event of a collision his vessel is less likely to be damaged than a slow one. But this also seems to be a fallacious assumption. If the fast ship runs into another ship, fast or slow, she will probably cut her down and escape with comparatively little injury. What, however, if she herself is struck amidships, or in any vital part? Her speed cannot save her then, but on the contrary, it is likely to augment the proportions of the disaster.

Aside from a few such fallacies as we have indicated, the testimony of the distinguished seamen, who have been good enough to communicate their opinions, demonstrates satisfactorily that a passenger on board a very fast steamer is quite as safe as on a very slow one. Speed does not necessarily increase peril. Summing up the evidence we find that the ship of great power

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not only diminishes the period of exposure to such dangers as there may be in the transatlantic voyage, but that she is also better fitted for meeting those dangers.

Fast ships are superior as sea-boats to ships of smaller power, more easily handled in fogs and heavy weather, despite their enormous size, and, as Captain Murray of the "Alaska" points out, their speed often enables them to make land by daylight, and to save tides, when slower ships would have to approach a treacherous coast at night, and anchor outside the harbor while waiting for a tide. The maximum of speed has certainly not yet been reached. In all probability the "City of New York" and the "City of Paris," which Messrs. James and George Thomson are building for the Inman Line, will surpass all that has heretofore been done, and they in turn may be left behind by still newer ships. Such extraordinary speed unquestionably calls for extraordinary vigilance on the part of the officers, and it is pleasant to note that in the new Inman ships several unique features are being introduced, which it is believed will make them unsinkable.

WILLIAM H. RIDEING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIRGINIA IN THE SUPREME COURT.

My question was:

"What is the meaning of the late decision of the Supreme Court in the Habeas Corpus cases from Virginia? Give me some idea of its historic relations as a Constitutional question."

The question is a very large one, but I will condense the answer so as not to be prolix, and yet clearly present the subject to the popular mind.

It is a fundamental principle of national law that no government can be enforced by suit to do what it does not will to do; unless it has by law consented to be sued. Thus the British Government can only be sued through a petition to the Crown for leave to present a claim against it, and then it is regarded as a matter of grace and not of right. For how can a court, which is the creature of a sovereign, compel the creator to do what he does not will to do? The power the court would use to compel obedience is that of the sovereign it would enforce, and thus, in the last analysis, it would be a case of self-compulsion.

But back of this, there are reasons of public policy, which make any external force improper and of evil tendency. The safety of a people may require all its resources to be devoted to that end, and the subjection of its means to the claims of every creditor or claimant might sacrifice the public good to private interests—the Commonwealth to the claim of an individual.

Under the Federal Constitution the United States, representing the combined sovereignties of the States of the Union, cannot be sued but by their consent; and hence all claims were originally proferred to Congress, and it was only thirty odd years ago that the Court of Claims was established by law, in which suitors might prosecute claims against the United States. But even under that law, the judgment is of no avail until Congress in good faith ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propriates money to pay it, when the Court has rendered it. To enforce the judgment by an execution against the property of the United States might divest the Government of the very buildings erected for the Congress and the Executive of the Union.

The same reasons obtain in respect to any one of the States. Salus populi, suprema lex is the maxim which subordinates private claims to the public and common weal; and, if it be set aside, as to a State or the union of States, the result might be disastrous, and would always be impolitic and injurious to the welfare of the public.

When the Federal Constitution was adopted, the judicial power of the United States was extended to controversies to which the United States shall be a party—but it was always construed to mean only such controversies, when the United States were plaintiffs, and not when they were defendants; to suits brought by, and not to those brought against, them.

The same clause gave judicial power to suits between a State and citizens of another State, or citizens and subjects of a foreign State. And this was held by Alexander Hamilton in the eighty-first number of the *Federalist,* written before the adoption of the Constitution, and as an inducement to the people to adopt it, to exclude the idea of any suit being brought *against* a State by citizens of another State, or by those of a foreign State.

Singular to say, however, "for the best laid schemes of mice and men aft gang aglee," the Constitution was not more than two years old when the Supreme Court of the United States entertained suits by citizens of other States, in and out of the Union, against several of the States. Massachusetts, New York, Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina and Georgia, were sued by their creditors and other claimants; and after a while, on the 18th of February, 1793, a judgment for a debt was rendered in the Supreme Court in favor of Mr. Chisholm against the State of Georgia.

This judgment excited great feeling, and created alarm in all the States. On the 20th of February, 1793 (two days after the judgment in Chisholm against Georgia), an amendment to the Constitution was proposed in the House of Representatives, declaring that "the judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit brought against a State" by any citizens of a State in the Union, or of a foreign State. But Congress ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

journed in ten days (it was proposed in the short session), and the proposition went over until 1794.

Both Houses of Congress adopted the amendment proposed with a significant modification. Had it passed as first proposed, it would have only operated on future cases. But the modification was in the new words, which made it read as it now stands in the Constitution as the 11th amendment:

"The judicial power of the United States shall not *be construed* to extend," etc.

In other words, the States in adopting this amendment declared to the Supreme Court itself, virtually, that you have construed the original Constitution improperly, and shall not so construe it again. You must hereafter construe it as meaning that no State can be sued in a Federal Court by any citizen, but the State may sue a citizen in that Court. She can sue, but shall not be sued by any such citizen.

John Hancock, President of the Congress of Independence, and signer of its declaration, was Governor of Massachusetts at the time; and Light Horse Harry Lee, grandfather of the present Governor of Virginia, was then Governor of Virginia. They corresponded on the subject. Governor Lee went to Philadelphia, where Congress was in session, to urge the adoption of the amendment, and Massachusetts, the land of the Pilgrims, and Virginia, the land of the Cavaliers, joined hands in saving to every State immunity from suit at the instance of any citizen of any other State. Nobody then ever dreamed that a State could be sued by its own citizens—nor did the Supreme Court so hold.

The amendment was adopted by the States with great unanimity.

As soon as its adoption was proclaimed, the Supreme Court dismissed all suits previously brought and still pending on its docket, and thenceforth the liability of a State on its obligations rested on public faith and the sovereign will of the State itself. The basis of public credit of the United States, and of every separate State, is the same—the sovereign will of the Union, the sovereign will of the State.

But a phase of this great question was presented then.

Both of these governments, that of the Union and that of a State, as is the government of any country, is a metaphysical being which can only act through physical agencies. It can only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collect its revenues by tax-gatherers, and hold its treasury by officials appointed for the purpose. It can take and hold property of all kinds, but only through the medium of persons clothed with authority to receive and to keep it.

It is obvious that these persons who are agents of government have thus a double relation to men and things around them. In one they are men with personal rights and personal responsibilities. In the other they are representatives of government, with official rights and official immunity from responsibility. What is done in the one relation they are personally liable for; for what is done in the other they are only liable representatively.

After long debate in the Courts, and many decisions in the last decade or more, more definite conclusions have been reached upon this distinction between personal and official action, and liability therefor. A discussion of the different cases would be inappropriate. But Virginia is the scene of two cases which illustrate the distinction on which a judicial rest has been reached in the forensic discussion which has been carried on in the Supreme Court for many years.

During the late Civil War, Arlington, the estate left by G. W. P. Custis, the grandson of the wife of George Washington, to his daughter Mary Custis Lee, the wife of Gen. Robert E. Lee, for her life, with remainder to Gen. G. W. Custis Lee, of Lexington, Va., in fee simple, was assessed by the officers of the United States with a direct tax of about $90. There was ample personal effects on the premises to pay it, but the official of the Government choose to offer the estate for sale, for default in paying the tax. The life tenant, and the remainder man, and the husband of the life tenant were in the Confederate States, with the blazing line of battle between them and the tax gatherer. A friend of the family was ready to tender and pay, and the hearsay evidence is, did tender the full tax. But the tax commissioners said the tax must be paid in person by Gen. Robert E. Lee, the husband of the owner for life, or by herself, or the patrimonial home would be sold to pay the tax.

It was sold for $30,000 and more, and the President authorized it to be bought in for the government for a military cemetery.

Under official orders, certain persons, officers of the United States, took and held Arlington—and claimed to hold it for the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mrs. Lee having died, General Custis Lee, the remainder man, petitioned Congress to pay him for the estate. Congress failed to act, and General Lee brought an action of ejectment against the *persons* in possession. These persons claimed, and the Attorney General of the United States claimed, that the possession was in the *persons* sued as representing the United States, and that the suit was in reality a suit against the United States, and could not therefore be maintained.

The case came to the Supreme Court, and it was decided in substance, that the persons, who were in actual possession and were actually sued, could not claim immunity from suit under the sovereign claim of the Government of the United States, unless they were legally in possession by the legal authority of the United States, and that as the whole procedure by which Arlington was sold for taxes, when the tax was ready to be paid, and was refused to be received, was illegal and unconstitutional, the United States had no title to hold it and could not, therefore, authorize anybody to hold it for them, and that, therefore, the persons in possession could not claim to represent the United States, but were in possession as personal trespassers on the legal rights of the plaintiff, who, therefore, had judgment for the estate affirmed. The personal right of the citizen to his property could not be taken away by a person in the name of a government, unless the Government could legally and constitutionally authorize it, and the person so acting could not claim immunity from suit by the citizen, upon the ground that the government could not be sued, when the Government had no legal right to the property at all. The right of the citizen was protected against the wrong of a person, who claimed falsely to act in behalf of the Government, which *could* not legally authorize the act, and therefore in legal contemplation did not authorize it.

After this decision, the Legislature of Virginia passed a law directing its collectors of taxes to refuse coupons clipped from bonds of Virginia, when tendered by the tax payer, on which coupon was the agreement of the State, under the law of 1870, that these coupons should be receivable for all taxes. This refusal the Supreme Court had repeatedly decided was an impairment of the obligation of the contract of the State evidenced by the coupon.

The law of Virginia, nevertheless, directed the tax collector to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refuse the coupons, and to levy upon and sell the property of the tax payer in order to the payment of the tax.

This the tax gatherer did, and a number of suits was the result—some for damages for the sale, some injunctions to prevent a threatened sale, and others for the recovery of the property levied upon and not sold.

These cases at last came under review in the Supreme Court in 1885, and were decided adversely to the claims of Virginia.

The Court held that the act of the tax collector in levying, taking or threatening to take the property of the citizen tax payer, who had tendered coupons in the payment of his taxes, was unlawful, and that he could not claim immunity from his liability for the personal wrong by alleging that he had acted by authority of the State, because the State could not be held to have given an unlawful and unconstitutional authority to do such an act, and the tax collector was held *personally* liable, and not *officially* exempt from liability by reason of an alleged authority from the State, which the State was constitutionally prohibited from delegating. The man was liable for his wrong because the State could not give him its immunity by an unconstitutional delegation of authority.

But Virginia claimed the right to require the authentication of the genuineness of the coupons tendered by other means than by their inspection by her tax collectors, who were not experts in the business.

Accordingly, to avoid the suits brought by tax payers for wrongful levy after a tender of coupons, Virginia, in May, 1887, passed a law requiring her collectors not to receive the coupons, but to report the names of those who tendered them to the law officers of the Commonwealth, whom she authorized to sue all such persons for their taxes due to her, and permitting them to plead their tender of coupons, and prove the tender of genuine coupons under their plea, bringing their coupons so tendered into Court, to be delivered up to the State upon proof of their genuineness.

This law thus assured the State against spurious coupons, and against a feigned tender of them; while it recognized the right of the tax payer to tender genuine coupons in discharge of his taxes, as the Supreme Court had decided.

A syndicate of owners of Virginia coupons then filed a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bill of injunction in the United States Court, praying the Court to enjoin the Attorney General and all the attorneys for the Commonwealth of Virginia from bringing any suits under that law in the name of Virginia. The injunction was granted. The Attorney General and some of the Commonwealth's attorneys disobeyed the injunction, and thereupon Judge Bend ordered them to be fined and imprisoned until they paid the fines imposed, and until they dismissed all the suits brought by them for Virginia against her delinquent tax payers, and in one case, until the attorney for the Commonwealth entered of record that a judgment recovered by Virginia against a tax payer upon a suit brought by him was satisfied.

The parties were all imprisoned. They prayed severally a writ of *habeas corpus* from the Supreme Court of the United States, principally on the ground that the whole proceeding was null and void, because, in fact, the injunction bill was a suit against Virginia, and without jurisdiction under the Eleventh Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

These great cases were argued on the 14th and 15th of November, and the Court decided them on the 5th of December last.

Seven judges concurred in the judgment, with one dissentient.

The judgment was full, able and elaborate, and discharged all the prisoners, on the distinct ground that the injunction suit was in reality a suit against Virginia, that all its proceedings were wholly null and void and contrary to the Eleventh Amendment of the Constitution, and that the law of Virginia directing suits to be brought was not in violation of the Constitution.

Thus this great decision has made a settlement of this important question, and has established the immunity of the States from all suits by citizens of other States, or of foreign States, whether directly or indirectly by suing their officers, when the effect is to coerce State will through judicial procedure.

This case will be a leading case and a judicial landmark for all time to come, in protecting the rights of the States from the coercive control of Federal Courts, and in conserving their autonomy in the management and direction of their own internal affairs.

J. RANDOLPH TUCKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POSSIBLE PRESIDENTS.

FRANK HISCOCK.

For twenty-four years the State of New York has given its electoral vote alternately to the two parties, and this singular record will be prolonged in the same order of preference if the Republicans win the campaign of 1888. Rational beings are neither expected nor desired to attach much importance to an irrelevant precedent. Yet, since by common consent all men are superstitious, and since, as the country has learned within four years, a trivial cause can produce an overwhelming result in politics as well as in nature, it is conceivable that the antagonists might be so closely matched as to throw the momentous choice of a President into the hands of that morbid infinitesimal minority who can never quite make up their minds that it is safe to trifle with coincidences, and who at such a juncture would be apt to think that they were amply justified in keeping step with the clear footfalls of fate. But these influences are not logically within the range of calculation, and therefore have no place in a discussion of the duty and opportunity of Republicans at the present moment. New York is not to be abandoned to the manipulation of chance this year. The determination is that it shall be won in a fair fight, and that accidents shall have less to do with the result than they had in 1884. I observe that here and there a sanguine dispenser of political consolation is rising to remark that we do not need the vote of New York to elect a President, and proving by indisputable figures that if a sufficient number of her sisters do their duty the party can laugh the Empire State out of the Electoral College. Burke declared that the age of miracles is past. That great statesman and philosopher has been dead a century less nine years, and we are still living under the same dispensation. New York must be carried,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and it is the business of the party in this State, between now and the 19th of June, to prove itself equal to the emergency by taking the one essential first step toward the November goal.

In some conspicuous instances it has happened that those upon whom Heaven has bestowed the rare felicity of gaining the ardent, almost adoring love of their fellow men, have found that they are none the less subject on that account to the law of compensations, and must be content to expand their affections at the expense of their ambition. Hostility is proportionate to devotion, and the balance is preserved. It is the duty of the few who represent the millions in a political organization, to forecast disaster and calmly to avert it, whether judgment follow the lead of inclination or no. The party is to-day in the possession of an opportunity, to the recognition of which I shall endeavor to contribute. Senator Hiscock stands for the opportunity to which I refer. Let me begin with a few negatives. He is not the leading candidate of the Republican party for the Presidency. He has no deputy at the headquarters of intrigue. He maintains no literary bureau. He has never taken hostages of the newspapers. He is not in the habit of making up his mind as an ornamental preliminary to changing it. He is a statesman and politician of the sort that flourished in the earlier days of the Republic, when sobriety of judgment, a quiet fidelity to present duties, adaptation to the higher planes of controversy, a talent for command when the time came, and a disinclination to anticipate the obligation were among the qualities required of public men.

Born and reared in New York, admitted to the bar in 1855, district attorney, member of the Constitution Convention of 1867, representative for ten years, senator—this is the brief record of extended service from which Frank Hiscock's status and stature are to be determined. To sensible persons the matter of physical perfection is unimportant, if only one be raised above that abyssmal depth of personal ugliness which a Yale professor once described as incompatible. He did not say with what it was incompatible, choosing rather to leave a wide field to the imagination. But without so much as a reference to his exterior advantages, there is no impropriety in the statement that Senator Hiscock possesses an outward distinction corresponding more nearly than fate often permits to the qualities within. The repose which denotes a greater force than it exhibits is one of his attributes, and shallow

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

critics have sometimes imagined what no one who has ever measured wits with him has had the fortune to discover, that this repose partakes of the nature of lethary. No such suspicion exists among the lawyers who have encountered the knowledge, the logic and the resource which for thirty years have been his recognized weapons in legal controversy ; nor among the statesmen who have too often had the misery of regretting upon the floor of Congress that their equipment was not equal to his own ; nor among the leaders of his party in this State who have more than once been forced to acknowledge that his skill was not inferior to his magnanimity.

Mr. Hiscock entered the field of national politics in the Forty-fifth Congress, and at once attracted the attention of the country by his discussion of certain contested election cases which were percipitated upon the House. The prominence thus early achieved made him, with the general approval of his Republican colleagues, one of the minority of the investigating committee whose purpose it was supposed at the time to be to dispute the title of President Hayes, and whose labors were unexpectedly diversified by the translation of the historical cipher dispatches. In that investigation he took a prominent if not preëminent part from first to last. In the Forty-sixth Congress he was a member of the committee which then originated all the general appropriations of the government except those for rivers and harbors. After the election of Garfield the speakership was conceded to Mr. Hiscock on both sides of the House; but Garfield's death and the consequent accession of a President from New York, to which State both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General were also apportioned in the geographical distribution of great offices, defeated him, and he was assigned to the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations. In the Forty-eighth Congress he was appointed to the Committee on Ways and Means, where he continued until the close of his service in the House. This summary of legislative assignments is a useful indication of the scope of his activities as a Representative. In the fundamental but unobserved labors of the committee room Mr. Hiscock is easily among the first of useful public servants. Speakers upon the floor of Congress may be divided into three classes: those who do not feel that they are filling the eyes of the country—and consequently might as well be silent—when they are not engaged in delivering

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elaborate political essays; those whose natural proclivities or the the suggestions of vanity dispose them to a pyrotechnical display of their readiness in badinage and repartee; and those whom inclination, obedient to a sense of duty, impels to the more practical work of securing the passage of good measures and the defeat of bad ones by the methodical and cogent presentation of facts conscientiously collected. It is to the last class that Mr. Hiscock belongs. It is his custom to apply his talents in debate to measures pending at the time of his speaking and about to be voted on. The record will show with what diligence and success he has pursued this useful policy. As an example, however, of his resources when he has found a suitable opportunity for the comprehensive treatment of a great general principle, I may be allowed to cite his speech of April 29, 1884, upon the relation of a protective tariff to agriculture, which attracted the immediate attention of the country, confirmed the highest estimate of his powers, and has become a part of the common fund of economic fact and argument. I wish, moreover, before closing this summary of Mr. Hiscock's legislative services, which is meant to be suggestive merely, to recall attention to his speech in the Forty-ninth Congress in opposition to the free coinage of silver, in which, if not absolutely the first to expond the principle that low prices are not the result of a contraction of the currency, but are due rather to the decrease in the labor cost of productions and the increased product per man-power, he so arranged the facts and forced home their significance as to carry conviction where others had scarcely obtained a hearing; to his plea in the same year for the extension of our commerce, with special reference to the great South Carolina market, in which he incidentally laid low the "subsidy" spectre that demagogues have long employed to frighten timid souls; to his strenuous defense of American dairies; to his dissection of the Morrison resolution on Treasury balances, and, during this, his first session in the Senate, to his speeches on the undervaluation of imports and the insidious pretences of the pleuro-pneumonia bill, and to his earnest appeal in behalf of international copyright.

This imperfect indication of the lines along which Senator Hiscock's sympathies and convictions have found expression is not designed to do more than impress upon the minds of those who have neglected to learn and upon the memories of those who might be led to forget his steadfast devotion to Republican ideals, his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

firm grasp of great principles, his love of what is intrinsically honest in laws and customs, and his faith that what is true will be permanent. For behind the record stands the man, and if I have partially succeeded in expressing the man we may safely turn to a consideration of his availability.

The word has been abused by its employment to denote a low conception of what conscience and common sense alike demand in a candidate for the Presidency. I beg the privilege of employing it in a very different sense. Senator Hiscock is available because his character, his temperament and his career justify the belief that he would if elected so administer his office as to advance his country; and because his relations to the forces which decide our quadrennial struggle warrant the prediction that if nominated he would be elected. One thing is already determined. Even if the individual preference of New York should not be the choice of the Convention, it is certain that, with such a contest before us, no combination of delegates at Chicago will be so rash as to force upon the Empire State an unwelcome candidate. The nominee will be a man whom the collective judgment of the party in New York believes to possess more strength here and elsewhere than any of his competitors. In his own State—the State of his birth and his home from infancy to the present hour—where his affections are centred, and for which his energies have been trained and expended, Senator Hiscock is invincible. No accident could trip him up. No acknowledged hostility, nor cynical indifference, nor narrow jealousy, nor local prejudice would keep voters at home or send them to the wrong ballot box. And what is true of New York is true of the whole country. There is not a State between the two oceans, nor a locality within a State, in which the conviction of Hiscock's claim upon the votes of men who love their country would not grow steadily stronger from the 19th of June to the 6th of November. We should hear nothing of desperate expediments, of attempts to kindle a fire with a damp combination of forlorn hopes, of empty parade made to pass for genuine enthusiasm, of wasted energy and ultimate despair. The campaign would be conducted on a high level. The dilettante coterie that engages in the discussion of politics only to proclaim that there is no difference between the parties would find before they had had time for many deliverances of this sort that there is a difference too vast to be bridged by a sneer. We should see a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revival of the spirit which has not had too many opportunities to manifest itself in recent years—the spirit that is inflamed only by the assurance that principles are being fought for, and that the battle bears some relation to the eternal verities.

WILLIAM B. ALLISON.

AFTER a century of government we ought to be able to define in some degree the characters chiefly favored by the Republic for its highest office.

In our earlier history this choice was made from the foremost men who were distinguished as leaders in the Revolutionary period and in that of the formation of the Constitution. After Washington, parties began to take shape and to elect their intellectual leaders. This period closed with Madison. With him was ended the epoch of strong, original, and creative statesmanship in Presidents. Monroe came in easily like a natural heir to the throne,—a gently-mannered man, accustomed to affairs of state, calm in judgment, moderate in temper, without initiative, and disposed to consult the wisdom of others. The country had a tranquil administration, and the second term was given to him without opposition.

Quincy Adams, indeed, threatened a return to the era of vigorous thinkers and original statesmanship. With him, consequently, the bitterness of party antagonisms arose, and he was replaced by the first President chosen from the region west of the Alleghanies, a man without precedent history of statesmanship, but well known as a military chief. After Jackson, there was a return toward partisan leadership in the election of Van Buren. But, as in the case of Quincy Adams, bitter antagonisms were developed, his term was short, and the people made his defeat a rout, when they elected Harrison, who was no party leader, but a man of average intellect and a patriot. Polk, Taylor, Pierce, and Buchanan followed, all men of mediocre talent, of mere respectability as statesmen, with greater men than themselves to guide their administration and direct legislation.

A new political era began with the election of Lincoln, a civilian candidate unknown to the country at large, and without experience in public affairs. The popular instinct shown in his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

choice was ratified by a wonderful career of patriotism and wisdom, which lifted him so high as to leave him no peer save Washington. Grant was a military candidate, elected because of his vast military service to the nation. In Hayes was again chosen a man representing the average intellect of the people, and who gave to them an upright and uneventful administration. All of these were men of originally humble fortune, and early struggles. They were followed by still another of the same class, but destined to an early end. What his administration would have been, but for the assassin, can never be known. All were Western men. The election of 1884 fell upon an Eastern man of whom little was known as a politician, but who has since developed the Van Buren qualities of partisan leadership.

What in all this drift of practical events is to be taken as the steady tendency of the American judgment? Are there any safe conclusions to be drawn from it touching the national predisposition for certain qualities and characteristics in presidential candidates.

We find that no strong, original, constructive statesman has been chosen by popular vote since Madison. Second: The people have frequently, since 1832, shown a fondness for candidates with a successful war record. Third: They have also, during the later period, been especially inclined to candidates of humble origin, who have nobly fought their way over obstacles to a deserved popular distinction. Fourth: Among civilians, they have turned away from brilliant orators like Wirt, Clay and Webster, and from party leaders like Van Buren, Cass, Douglass, Breckenridge and Greely, and have preferred such men of average intellect as Harrison, Polk, Pierce, Buchanan and Hayes, and as Lincoln was supposed to be when first elected. Fifth: They have turned their backs upon noted partisans who excite rancor and antagonism, and for their supreme office have rather made choice of a candidate from whom they could expect a softening of political asperities, and a conciliatory conduct of public affairs.

Another notable fact attracts attention. During the last fifty years—since 1836, when Van Buren was elected—every Western candidate running against an Eastern candidate has been elected, and the latter defeated. (Fremont was only nominally a Californian.) Whenever a candidate living east of the Alleghanies has been elected, it was against a candidate also from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

East. Every successful *Republican* candidate has been from the West.

This should fairly indicate that the mass of voters find in Western characters a more satisfactory representation of the average national opinion, a more sympathetic appreciation of popular wants, and a greater freedom from class interests than they expect from the older parts of the country—men better disposed to the conciliation of interests and of sentiments between all sections of the country.

Among the civilian candidates now offered for the Presidency, are there any who will attract these dominant currents of national opinion, which have hitherto usually led to success ?

We look for a man not so ambitious as to force himself on his party or the country ; for the people like better to make the candidate than to have one made for them. They have shown such a marked preference for men who represent their estimated average of the requisite mental powers, combined with personal worth and practical sense, that their wishes must be respected. They do not find sufficient assurance of safety in the brilliant flashings of oratory, or in the secret plottings of party leadership. In this the people are wiser than the enthusiasts and man-worshipers who criticise them.

The people of the young, vigorous, agricultural State of Iowa have presented such a candidate as we seek, in the person of William B. Allison. It was done with singular unanimity and with enthusiasm. Having done that, she wants to hear the voice of her sister States. Let us look at this candidate more nearly.

He comes from that frontier stock which peopled the valleys of the Alleghenies, and broke into the forests of Ohio, and changed the wilderness into an abode of free and prosperous men. His blood is derived from that early Irish ancestry which sought civil and religious liberty beyond the reach of British bayonets. Both of his grandfathers and his grandmother found a home in the interior of Pennsylvania. His father was born in 1798, at Bellefonte, in that State ; but sought new lands and a new home further west in 1823. On the farm of 80 acres which his father opened in Wayne County, Ohio, and in the log house which he built upon it, this son was born, March 2d, 1829.

At this frontiersman's house he learned how poor men live and labor. In the winters he pursued the usual studies at a com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mon school in the timber, two miles away, and received there the customary discipline of flogging. By the common toil of an intelligent family the farm became more prosperous, and was enlarged. His father was glad to yield to the boy's wishes for a better education, and sent him for two years to the academy at Wooster, his vacations being occupied with work on the farm. It was the old story of our Western farm boys. He had no sooner learned enough to know how much more than was to learn than he became impatient to acquire more and higher education, and found it first at the Alleghany College in Meadville, Pa., and next at the Western Reserve College in Ohio. By perseverance, and by earning something for himself, he was then able to read law. He commenced its practice at Ashland, and also began to take part in the political movements of the time, in support of Scott and Fremont, and of liberty against slavery.

But fortune did not smile sufficiently upon the young lawyer in a community where too many older men competed with the young, and the frontier blood in his veins impelled him further West. He had heard of the virgin prairies and growing villages of Iowa, not long before won from the Indian tribes. In 1857 he made his home under the bluffs of Dubuque, where he now lives. Soon after the election of Lincoln, to whose support he contributed all the vigor of his young manhood; the Southern rebellion roused the young blood of the North and the loyalty of the whole country. The men of Iowa left their plows to grasp their guns and crowded to the rendezvous for enrollment into regiments. The governor summoned Allison to his staff, with the rank of colonel, to aid in the organization and equipment of these regiments for the field. This work he performed with zeal and energy until prostrated by exposure in camp and consequent illness.

The next year, 1862, the Northwestern district of Iowa elected Colonel Allison to Congress by a very large majority, and again in 1864 by an increased majority, and continued him in the House for four Congresses, when he declined a renomination. But his vacation was short. In 1872 the State sent him to the United States Senate, and has kept him there ever since, without any struggle for a change, so satisfactory has been his public service. It has been his fortune to serve chiefly on the great committees of Ways and Means, Appropriations and Finance, bringing him in close contact with all the machinery and all the varied operations

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of government, and with all the great industries of the people. In this knowledge he is unsurpassed. The record of the great Republican measures which have given freedom to a race and prosperity to the nation is also his record. The amendment offered by him, and his casting votes, settled the sharp controversy touching the present silver coinage act. He believed that for many years we could depend upon the great continental area and increasing population of our country to absorb silver money, without displacement of gold. So long as they maintained harmony in circulation, he foresaw plainly the increase of the circulating medium, by adding silver to gold and paper, and the consequent reduction in rates of interest, with increased facilities for business. Beyond this point of community of circulation and value he has never proposed to go. In this he has had the endorsement of the nation.

He is equally divided upon the other important and pending questions of our national industries and labor. He believes in their steady protection against foreign capitalists and foreign paupers. He believes in high wages rather than low, because high wages educate more, consume more, and buy more, and make better citizens. He would protect Christian labor against Chinese because the former can be assimilated and naturalized into citizenship; the latter never—it is always an alien. In a word, he is American, not British nor Asiatic.

In debate Col. Allison is not an orator, but a clear, honest and direct speaker; as free from flourishes of fancy as was Madison. The confidence of the Senate in his statements is very notable, his explanations being so uniformly trustworthy. The country first, and the party for the country is his guiding maxim. His methods and his manners are so unpretentious and conciliatory that they invite support instead of provoking antagonism.

Such is the public man. The private man is affable, accessible, friendly, and fond of domestic life. His second marriage was with the daughter of the late Senator Grimes, a lady of most winning manners, and lovely character. His grief at her loss in 1883 is still shared by his friends. For her sake he declined the offered seat in General Garfield's Cabinet, as Secretary of the Treasury. He loves his friends, and has no enemies to hate. "Stalwarts" and "half-breeds" alike respected his personal independence and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amiable character, which made them his friends, but which forbade him to wear the yoke of either. All the displaced wheels of a great party could adjust themselves to this balance-wheel without friction, and without embarrassment. More brilliant intellects than his own could shine in his Cabinet, as they did in Monroe's and Lincoln's, and derive strength from that incandescent light of COMMON SENSE which is Col. Allison's high characteristic. It is this which will form a strong bond between him and the American people, of whose judgment it makes him the true interpreter. His administration would bring in an era of peace, confidence and goodwill; replacing an epoch of the violation of public pledges, and of political assaults on national industries and labor.

The intellect of Col. Allison, his temper, carefulness in public affairs, and conciliatory character, bear so striking a resemblance to those qualities in President Monroe, that we should confidently expect for his administration a like success, and an unanimity of approval like that which greeted Monroe in 1821.

CHAUNCEY MITCHELL DEPEW.

THE good luck of Mr. Depew has not deserted him in this series. "The first shall be last and the last first," says the Scriptural proverb. Mr. Blaine, who was the first on the list of Possible Presidents,* has written a letter declining to be a candidate. Mr. Depew, last, but not least, comes to the front at the finish, like a racehorse that has reserved its supreme speed. In the next number of this Review the name of the Probable President may appear, even if the sure successor to Mr. Cleveland be not infallibly indicated by events.

There are many politicians, both Republican and Democratic, in whom the wish is father to the thought, who confidently predict that, after a few indecisive ballots, a cyclone of enthusiasm will burst upon the Republican National Convention, and Mr. Blaine be nominated by acclamation. Fortunately the Republicans do not require a cyclone.

It might be an excellent thing for the country if the coming

* *See* POSSIBLE PRESIDENTS, J. G. BLAINE, NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, September, 1887.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

election could be decided upon principles, not men; if both parties would toe the mark squarely upon the Tariff question, the Democrats boldly advocating that Free Trade policy which they call tariff reduction, and the Republicans as boldly declaring for Protection and the abolition of the Internal Revenue taxes. The immense surplus urges its one hundred and fifty millions of arguments in favor of some policy that will prevent the useless accumulation of the people's money in the Treasury, and the people ought to settle by their votes whether they prefer to have cheaper imported goods and raw materials or cheaper whiskey, domestic wines and tobacco, with the privilege of conducting their business undisturbed by the supervision of government spies. This plain question, properly put before the country, might break up the solid South and the solid West. Some Southern States might be tempted from Democracy by the offer of free tobacco; some Western States from Republicanism by the offer of free imports, and the nation would be benefitted by these changes. But, as this simple issue would also break up both of the present political parties, it will be impossible to raise the question so bluntly in November. There are strong Protectionists among the Democrats; there are equally strong Free Traders among the Republicans. Neither party will deprive itself of a large body of voters by taking a decided stand. The Democrats will argue that their tariff reduction is only a measure of expediency, to get rid of the surplus, and the Republicans will endeavor to take advantage of the blunders of their adversaries without presenting any definite alternative. Therefore, the coming election, like the last, will be practically fought out in New York; and here is the unequaled strength of Mr. Depew.

The change of a few hundred votes in New York would have defeated Mr. Cleveland. Now, the candidacy of Mr. Depew would change several thousands of votes in this State, drawing them from the discontented Democrats, from the Mugwumps, from that class who are usually indifferent and call themselves Independent.

Mr. Cleveland carried New York because he had been a reform Mayor and a reform Governor, and because he had the prestige and assistance of Mr. Tilden, and because the Stalwarts and the Mugwumps feared and hated Mr. Blaine. This fear and hatred does not extend to Mr. Depew. The Stalwarts have no leader.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Mugwumps confess the futility of intrusting their Civil Service hobby to the party of Andrew Jackson. In local popularity Mr. Cleveland cannot compare with Mr. Depew, who has been identified with New York all his life. He was born of an old Dutch family, at Peekskill; he was educated in New York; he graduated at Yale, then joined the New York Bar, and made his début in politics at Albany. He knows personally every politician and almost every journalist in the State, and all of them, irrespective of party, admire and esteem him. He was a lobbyist at the time when votes were won by wit and argument and influence, not bought with bribes of hard cash paid through an accredited agent or over the poker table. Commodore Vanderbilt engaged him as counsel for the New York Central Railroad, at a salary of $25,000 a year—then the salary of the President of the United States—and he always acknowledged that Mr. Depew earned the money. He could not have earned it by corrupt, dishonest practices, for he has retained the confidence of the Vanderbilt family, and now has charge of their vast railroad interests. Had he been a lobby agent of the modern type, Commodore Vanderbilt would have used him, but never trusted him. The Vanderbilt connection, which has been made an objection to the nomination of Mr. Depew, is his clear certificate of integrity, fidelity, and honor.

Another phase of this objection is the presumed hostility to Mr. Depew of what is called the Labor Vote. He has always been associated with Capital and capitalists; he has been the attorney and is now the chief officer of a railroad, and this brands him with the stigma of Monopoly, to which the workingmen are bitterly opposed. But there is another side to this argument. Mr. Depew has been a firm friend of his employés; they trust him; they have found no strikes nor boycotts necessary on the lines which he manages; on the contrary, they have stood out against every effort to drag the Depew roads into the labor troubles of other corporations. His men are kindly cared for, on duty and off duty. They are promoted from the ranks for good conduct. One of them, James Henry Rutter, who began as a clerk in the freight-office, was made president of the New York Central. They have fair hours and fair pay, and they have been presented with a handsome club-house in which to enjoy themselves. There is no doubt that every person in the employ of Mr. Depew would cast a Labor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vote for him. But are other workingmen to be credited with no common-sense? Have they not observed, and perhaps envied, the happy family on Mr. Depew's lines? Instead of being frightened into voting against him by the bugbear of Monopoly, may they not enthusiastically support him, singling him out as a model to other employers, elevating him as a shining example, and thus demonstrating that American workingmen can appreciate and reward just and kindly treatment? To doubt this is to condemn the Labor Party as destitute of reason.

As between Mr. Depew and any other Possible Candidate yet named in either party, the probabilities are that the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Knights of Labor, the Anti-Poverty Society, and the Henry George faction—if Mr. George have a following now—would indorse Mr. Depew. Why should any workingman oppose one of the best employers that workingmen ever had? Socialists and Anarchists may shut their eyes to facts and blindly attack all capitalists indiscriminately; but their votes are too few to be of consequence.

Recent State conventions in Connecticut and New Jersey have shown that, upon the Tariff issue, these may be doubtful States. The Democratic conventions have eulogized Mr. Cleveland as a political necessity; but they have not heartily approved of his Tariff schemes. The New Jersey Democrats want their manufactures protected. The Connecticut Democrats want their tobacco farms freed from taxation. Mr. Depew's position, as defined in his Chicago oration and in the resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Union League Club, over which he presided, is the same as that of Mr. Blaine and Senator Sherman. He is in favor of abolishing the Internal Revenue system and of a tariff for the protection of American industries. Granting, then, that in this respect he is equal to Blaine and Sherman in these pivotal States, his railroad influence gives him immense advantages over them as a Presidential candidate.

Connecticut and New Jersey are State bridges, across which dash the trains that connect New York with the East and the South. They are gridironed with railroads in their politics as well as on their soil. The railroads pay their State taxes; build up their cities and towns; take their products to market; enable their manufacturers to compete with those of the metropolis. The railroad associations of Mr. Depew are thus invaluable to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him in the very States where reinforcements are most needed by the Republicans. Any Republican candidate can obtain the electoral votes of Maine; any good Republican candidate can be sure of Ohio; but Mr. Depew, through the peculiar circumstances of his position is the only Republican candidate who can be certain of a large vote, outside of his own party, in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. This Railroad Vote is quite as important, if its effect upon State legislatures be any criterion, as the Labor Vote. It elected President Garfield, although the Stalwarts claimed to have organized the victory. Not until a few days before the election, after a cipher message had been telegraphed along the railroad lines, did the Garfield managers feel secure. When the secret history of that campaign comes to be written, it will be seen that Jay Gould had more influence upon the election than Grant and Conkling.

Mr. Blaine astonished his party, in 1884, by coaxing a large number of Irish voters from the Democratic camp. It had previously been understood that every Irishman was born a Democrat and voted the Democratic ticket as naturally as a duck takes to water. There was nothing objectionable to the Irish in Mr. Cleveland; nothing in his record to offend the most fanatical Home Ruler. Yet, almost without warning, the Sixty-ninth Regiment deserted the Democratic colors, and a numerous Irish contingent followed and cut down the Cleveland vote in New York amazingly. Why? Was it because of the whisper that Mr. Blaine or his wife or some member of his family was a Catholic? Was it because the Irish voters expected that Mr. Blaine would declare war against England? Whatever the motive, it was strong enough to hold the Irish voters in spite of the Rev. Mr. Burchard's malapropos alliteration. It still holds them; for, when Governor Hill presented Archbishop Croke's flag to the Sixty-ninth Regiment, a few weeks ago, Mr. Cleveland's name was hissed. Now, whatever strength there may be in Irish sympathy, Mr. Depew shares it equally with Mr. Blaine. The incident at the banquet of the St. George Society has developed this feeling. Professor Goldwin Smith, whose aggressiveness is said to have exiled him from England and made cold Canada too warm for him, undertook to instruct our British residents in regard to American sentiment toward Ireland. He said that the educated classes in this country do not sympathize with the Irish in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggle for Home Rule. This was Mr. Depew's opportunity. Under his grave, sedate demeanor, he began to roast the Professor with witty words that literally burned. He modestly claimed to know as much about American sentiment as the exile from Oxford, and eloquently asserted that nine-tenths of the American people, of all classes, educated or uneducated, are in favor of Home Rule everywhere. The courteous but indignant phrases blistered Professor Smith's notoriously sensitive skin, and, in his sufferings a few days after, he interrupted his lecture upon poetry, at Ithaca, to complain that he had been insulted at the St. George banquet by "a politician in the way of his trade." Mr. Depew is not a professional politician, nor is it his "trade" to win votes; but, had the pursuit of popularity been his avocation he could not have succeeded more completely than by his prompt rebuke to Professor Smith.

Equally successful, but in a different spirit, was Mr. Depew's speech at the Grant Birthday dinner, when, in the presence of representative Union and Confederate soldiers, he crumpled up "the bloody shirt" and threw it under the table, like a used napkin. "The political divisions of our country," he said, "are inevitable and necessary for its freedom and prosperity; but they should not be upon sectional lines. A solid North has been broken. A solid South should also disappear. We leave this hall to carry into the Presidential campaign our best efforts for the success of the principles in which we believe, the parties to which we belong, and the candidates whom we honor. Let us make no compromise of principles; but let us remember that the country is greater than the party. To-night the spirit of the great Commander hovers over us and passes us in review. Let us be worthy of his approbation by bringing about such coalitions, all over the country, that we may fight our political battles under the common banner of patriotism and peace."

The next day the papers which published this oration announced that "Depew's Boom is Growing." It grew because everybody who heard or read the speech felt that Mr. Depew was worthy of the Presidency. Ex-Congressman Smart, one of the former Stalwart leaders, a delegate to the Chicago Convention, said: "The Stalwarts can support Depew. He has never stooped to any intrigues against us; he has the respect of all Republicans, irrespective of factions. With the New York delegation at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his back, as I believe it will be, I do not see what there is to prevent his nomination."

But New York will present Mr. Depew's name to the Republican Convention with loving reluctance, as well as with pride. To part from him, even to make him President, will be a sacrifice. The country will be the gainer, but New York will lose its favorite orator. At every public dinner, social, political, collegiate, literary, artistic, he will be missed. President Depew may be present, but the Chauncey M. Depew, who so often set the table in a roar or thrilled the applauding crowd, will be absent; for a President, like the Speaker of the House, must not orate. Who, having once seen him rise at a friendly banquet, can forget the tall, solemn figure; the face, clean-shaven, except for its neatly trimmed whiskers; the large, bluish-gray eyes; the preternaturally demure demeanor; the appearance and deportment of an English barrister without his wig, or an English clergyman without his gown? Who, having once heard him, can forget the cool, calm, tireless voice that gives a new force to fun and a new depth to eloquence?

Unlike all other American humorists, Mr. Depew coins no comic phrases, tells no stories, makes no puns, indulges in no tricks of words or manner. Unlike all other American orators, he seeks to inflame no passions, to excite no prejudices; he says nothing and does nothing to arouse his hearers. Like Antony, he "only speaks right on," expressing plain, common sense in simple language. If this common sense exposes shams, makes pretences ridiculous and affectations absurd, the room rocks with laughter. If it inspires patriotism, stimulates sentiment, impresses great thoughts upon the audience, the hall rings with cheers. Before a jury or a Legislative committee, or a political meeting, or a dinner party, Mr. Depew's manner and method are the same. He is as fluent as Gladstone; but, while Gladstone's sentences are verbose, Depew's are terse and clear. His eloquence is like the ocean, that tosses up waves of wit and crests them with the foam of poetry; but beneath, the sparkling surface is deep and steadfast and mighty. When his audience roar, he seems unconscious of the fun. When they hurrah, there is no answering flash in his steady eyes. He means what he says; he has thought it all out carefully, as his logical arrangement and felicitous phrases prove; he says it because it is his duty to speak, and he is unconcerned

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether those who hear him laugh or cheer so long as they allow him to convince them of the correctness of his views, be they serious or satirical.

Such, in his person, his oratory, his business associations, and his political advantages is the Possible President whom New York recommends to the Republican Convention. No one can be asked to love him for the enemies he has made, because he has never made any—except Prof. Goldwin Smith! He is everybody's friend: the Felix Featherly of American politics. Among the Republican candidates he is the "Seek No Further;" rosy, sweet, delicious, nutritious, and sound to the core; but if the Republicans do not choose to take him, because he has ripened in the Vanderbilt orchard, so much the worse for their taste and health—and Mr. Depew will still smile contentedly in the golden sunshine of general popularity.

BENJAMIN HARRISON.

On the 13th of October, 1660, Samuel Pepys made this record in his diary: "I went out to Charing Cross to see Major-General Harrison hanged, drawn and quartered; which was done there, he looking as cheerful as any man could do in that condition. He was presently cut down and his head and heart shown to the people, at which there was great shouts of joy. It is said that he said that he was sure to come shortly at the right hand of Christ to judge them that now had judged him, and that his wife do expect his coming again. Thus it was my chance to see the King beheaded at White Hall and to see the first blood shed in revenge for the King at Charing Cross."

The descendants of Thomas Harrison, the patriot of the commonwealth, who had been appointed by Cromwell to convey Charles I. from Windsor to White Hall, and who sat as one of his judges, emigrated to America in early colonial days, and preserving the family traditions, in due time furnished a signer of the Declaration of Independence, in the person of Benjamin Harrison, who was sent in 1774 to the Continental Congress from Virginia, was twice a Representative and thrice Governor of the State. Dying in 1791, he left a son, William Henry, who for half a century served his country in peace and war; fought the battle of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tippecanoe, where he gained a useful sobriquet in addition to his fair share of martial fame; was Representative, Senator and Foreign Minister, and died in the White House one month after his inauguration as ninth President of the United States. Among his surviving children was John Scott, who was a Member of Congress for two terms, and who otherwise served his country by begetting a son, Benjamin Harrison, for whom the American people are likely to think ninety-six months in the White House none too long a tenure. Benjamin was born August 20, 1833, in his grandfather's house at North Bend, Ohio. He was graduated at Miami University, which, being established in the town of Oxford, might have taken a statelier name without opprobrium; was admitted to the bar, married at the age of twenty, removed to Indianapolis, gained an early reputation for diligence and pertinacity, entered public life as an ardent speaker in the great campaign of 1856, was elected Reporter of the Supreme Court of Indiana, abandoned his family and his profession to enter the volunteer army as a lieutenant, fought long and well and went home a Brigadier General. The sunshine of military fame did not blind him to the sober but solid advantages of legal eminence, and he took up again the studies and labors of an advocate, steadily achieved a secure position at the bar, and in the respect of his fellow-citizens, was the Republican candidate for Governor of Indiana in 1876, was elected a United States Senator in 1881, and served six years.

This is the brief record of a life which is familiar enough to make complete details unnecessary for my purpose. It was not my design to write a campaign biography of General Harrison, but merely to draw the salient outlines, before proceeding to a consideration of the opportunity which his preservation to this time in undoubted health and strength and eager capacity for wider service offers to his party. It is not a dazzling career and his is not adazzling personality; but he has wrought out within and about him a combination of conditions which, at this moment, are as valuable to the Republican organization as they are creditable to himself. It may be said, without much danger of contradiction, that a considerable proportion of the native-born citizens of the United States, above the age of 35 years, are candidates for the Presidency, and it is not improbable that in the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, a marvelously long procession

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be formed of those who, unsuspected of their fellows, have felt at one time or another, at least, the first faint ecstasy of hope. But from the point of view which common sense assumes, the only candidates worth talking about are those about whom great numbers of practical men have already talked. Practical men, I say; if any one prefers the phrase practical politicians, I shall not quarrel with him. I may have occasion to use the word several times, and I shall use it unblushingly. It happens to be the only word which the language offers for the use of the idea, and it has, moreover, for honorable men, an honorable significance. There were heroes before Agamemnon, and there will be politicians long after the delicate creatures who shrink from anything short of "statesmanship" have been laid to rest. Nothing is more absurd, and there are manifold absurdities in current discussion, than the fancy that a certain body of men called "the people" can ever hold to their hearts or present to the gaze of the world a candidate for popular suffrage with whom a certain other body of men called "the politicians" will have nothing to do. The man whom the people want—the people's candidate—is the man whom the politicians spend their days and nights in looking for; and when they have found him they hold him fast. It always has been so, and always will be so, wherever the voters are free and intelligent. Let us then accept the simple definition of a candidate for the Republican nomination in this year of grace and promise, as one who now, three weeks before the convention, is believed by many efficient captains in the party organization, each representing directly and inevitably many party voters, to be the man for whom all are searching. Of course "dark horses" have more than once pranced out of political conventions with the blue ribbon round their necks. Under the spur of the moment, they sometimes come in winners, but they have no place in a preliminary examination. Discuss their points, and they are no longer dark. General Harrison is a candidate—open, avowed, accepted, approved. We have seen who he is, let us see what he represents.

In the first place he represents the Republican party of Indiana, which has just instructed its delegates to Chicago to present him to the convention as its unreserved choice. Indiana must always be thought of among the first when the subject of doubtful States is introduced. It has been for eight years at least and will be this year fair fighting ground, where the greater skill and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prudence and energy are sure of their reward, and where a blunder is most fatal. There is no disposition on the part of Indiana Republicans to sacrifice the party to local pride. They are not in the mood to trifle with the great electoral vote of New York. But they are absolutely certain that they can give their own fifteen electoral votes to the Republican nominee if the essential opportunity is afforded them; that with General Harrison for President the second place on the ticket would in the natural order of things be so filled as to secure the nine votes of New Jersey and the six votes of Connecticut—possibly also the twelve votes of Virginia—and all this without the loss of a single existing chance in any other State. If New York were able to name a candidate, elsewhere unopposed, and fortified by any such prevailing assurance of his ability to carry that State against all contingencies as exists with respect to Harrison and Indiana, the problem would be solved, and the work of the convention done in advance. But no man occupies that position. We hear the off-hand announcement and the glib consent that this candidate or that can win New York, but such utterances neither express nor carry a conviction. Those who make them really mean that they are inclined to think that under favorable conditions, which may or may not exist, and with the accidents of a campaign in their favor, the result would probably verify their prediction. This state of mind is as far removed as possible from that in which Indiana Republicans are steadfastly supporting General Harrison. They know that he can carry Indiana. That is one of the things which are settled. And, moreover, on that point the rest of the country agrees with them. His most prejudiced adversary has never even hinted at the possibility that he might lose his own State. Indiana is his, now and in November. It is no part of my purpose to promote the choice of any candidate for the Vice-Presidency. But I will venture merely to observe in passing that the possibilities suggested by the combination of Harrison and Phelps, or Harrison and Hawley are exceedingly pleasant to contemplate.

I have naturally written first of General Harrison in his relations to the Indiana canvass, with a bare allusion to his strength elsewehere; but I have no concession in reserve. I cannot detect in any quarter the growth of a respectable conviction that his selection would imperil any existing chance of Republican success.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He has the requisite capacity and the requisite availability. For the pleasure of consigning to its own place the sneer with which this word is sometimes uttered I desire to say that to be an "available" Republican candidate for the Presidency is to be all that a man can reasonably hope to make himself in this world, by way of preparation for a world to come. It is to be brave, sincere, high-minded and humane, ambitious and competent to grasp the rewards of ambition. It is, besides this, to have impressed upon the minds and hearts of many men in many places the sense of confidence, of admiration and gratitude. It is in such an attitude and on such an eminence that General Harrison's career and character have placed him before the people. This is a family discussion, and we all want to reach the truth before it is ended. Let us therefore look across the continent and see what there really is in the talk about a dangerous hostility to General Harrison on the Pacific Slope. It has suited the convenience of a few of our brethren, whose intentions are more apparent than their discrimination, to raise a cloud of suspicious dust around the Chinese question, with the expectation that others will not care to strain their eyes in the effort to see through it. I have noticed that they will not demean themselves by descending to particulars, and that I may not annoy them needlessly, and because my time is short, I will deny myself the pleasure of expounding the record. General Harrison has no reason either to fear or regret his attitude on the Chinese question. If at any time there was a disposition on the part of some who feel deeply but do not always see straight to put an imaginary interpretation upon the purposes of a statesman who has enjoyed the somewhat rare advantage of bringing both a clear conscience and a clear head to the solution of problems which involve the future, that time has passed, and with it have disappeared the passion and the prejudice which clouded the issue. The Chinese question has been settled for many years to come by treaty stipulations, and is no longer an affair for practical politics to deal with. The Pacific Coast will unite cordially in the sentiment which is impelling the nearer Western States to recognize in the candidacy of General Harrison a unique combination of advantages.

I have alluded to the cheerful prospect which a happy combination with General Harrison as the head of the ticket affords. The capture of Indiana and New Jersey from the enemy's column

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would make the result in New York a matter of practical indifference at the end of the campaign. But I am not zealous to reckon on so small a margin. Allowing, for the sake of the argument, that the Empire State is indispensable, is there a candidate in the field who dares claim for himself, or whose friends dare claim for him, that he can poll more votes than Harrison? Is there one who does not see himself confronted on the threshold of the struggle with some element of opposition that can be neither laughed nor argued out of sight? Whether it be the ghost of Roscoe Conkling, or the trail of a corporation, or the favor or enmity of Wall street, or the apprehension of industry, there it is—a very ugly object for a nervous man to behold. But Harrison is obliged to make no such disquieting confession. He is neither the *protegé* nor the *bête noir* of a faction. He represents in New York as completely as in Indiana the record and the aspirations of a united party. He is not a victim of the fatal delusion that a candidate is strong in proportion as he caters to the fag end of this or that class or nationality. His advocates expect him to poll the full vote that properly belongs to the unmistakable embodiment of Republican principles. That vote has not been polled in recent years. When it is, the man for whom it is cast will be elected.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GHOSTS, DREAMS AND HYPNOTISM.

INTEREST in what is commonly called spiritualism or the supernatural is perennial. Now and then it rises to unusual prominence, as in the recent case of the Debar woman; but at all times there is a dormant interest which assures a numerous audience, outside of the regular spiritualistic ranks, for any well-told story of new or startling phenomena. This is easily accounted for by the superstitions which are common to the human race. Very few intelligent people will admit that they believe in ghosts, but it is safe to say that not one man in ten thousand can walk alone at night through a lonely graveyard, without experiencing an uncanny sensation that is something akin to fear. The nerves are keenly alive to every mysterious light or shadow, sound or motion, and he must indeed be a bold man who, under such conditions, can encounter unmoved anything that looks like the traditional ghost. It is this inborn superstitiousness that lends a charm to the séance and places a potent weapon in the hands of impostors.

But setting aside all charlatanry, there is an overwhelming amount of evidence from people who are presumably truthful to the effect that they have actually seen persons and things "materialize," as the phrase goes, out of nothing. The fact that many persons cannot see such phenomena when others do see them proves nothing. The world is full of sights and sounds that are invisible to some, but visible to others.

Accepting it as a fact, then, that some persons under certain conditions think that they see certain things, how is it to be accounted for?

To most of us the phenomena of dreams are more or less familiar. They vary greatly in vividness, but almost every one at times has very real experiences during sleep. There is an artist well known to the writer whose dreams are so intensely lifelike that he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is often unable to determine whether some past series of events is real or unreal. In his dreams he is very much given to jumping off from any lofty height on which he finds himself ; but he often asks whether he is asleep or awake, before taking the leap, and has certain tests which he applies to convince himself that he may venture. Conversely, when he is awake, and having a particularly agreeable time, he is often in doubt whether it is real or unreal.

In his case, the margin between physical and mental vision is very narrow. With most of us it is considerably wider; but who shall draw a sharp dividing line ? Given certain, at present, undefined conditions, why may not the physical power of sight become obscured, while the mental eye becomes keenly active ? And if this be true of an individual, why not of an entire company ? There are, it is true, many persons to whom such delusions may seem impossible in a normal or healthy state, but an attack of malaria, with its frequently attendant delirium, may call up before them realistic simulacra of the departed, or cause them to see sights as baseless as the fabric of dreams. Artificial delusions, too, may be produced by drugs well-known to chemists.

Opium, Indian hemp and alcohol are capable of stimulating and distorting the mental vision, when taken in excess, proving that the quality of seeing the invisible is merely latent, and requires only the proper stimulant for its temporary development.

Again there are the phenomena so ably discussed in a recent number of the REVIEW. It is a recognized fact that the senses of hypnotics fall completely under the control of the hypnotizer. They see, hear, feel, smell and taste according to his will. In their brains a mysterious something exists in an abnormal degree, but by all reasonable analogy it must be present in a lesser degree in every other human brain. Favorable conditions may make any one hypnotic to some extent, in a degree sufficient, perhaps, to dull the physical vision and excite the mental vision. Naturally enough a company of sympathetics may be similarly influenced, and it follows that if a few non-sensitives are present their influence may make itself felt, and the hypnotizer, medium or experimenter may fail utterly where he has been accustomed to succeed.

The Orientals are highly successful in this class of experiment. Every Eastern traveler tells of having witnessed feats which can only be explained on one assumption—he believes that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he saw them; and if we believe that we have seen a thing we are justified in *saying* that we have seen it.

The phrase "second sight," carries a meaning which implies prophetic power, but really there appears to be a second sight common to a large proportion of the human race, and which has been referred to as mental vision. The recognition of its existence greatly simplifies a vast number of inexplicable matters. To it may be fairly ascribed many of the contradictions of eye-witnesses in courts of law; within its range float the ghosts and apparitions of all ages, and it remains for science to take cognizance of it and make it subserve the common good.

Possibly this quality of vision—and the same is true of all the other senses and perceptions—may have something to do with the new schools of mind cure, faith cure, and the like. Authentic as are the records of failures in this line of practice, it is equally certain that singular cases of recovery or cure have occurred under their auspices, and therein lies a lesson which skeptics are slow to learn. All physicians are agreed that if a patient believes himself to be convalescent the battle is half won. Here is the true stronghold of the mind and faith "doctors," the mesmerizers, and all the rest, some of whom are sincere and earnest persons, and others arrant frauds. Custom and tradition have established it as the professional duty of all orthodox practitioners to frown upon such practices, but they all prescribe "bread pills" upon occasion, and that is neither more nor less than an appeal to the imagination, with a view to influencing the patient's belief regarding his own condition.

The physician would be phenomenally successful who, by a mere act of volition, could induce a sort of waking on the part of the patient in which symptoms should take a favorable turn. In other words, if the patient can be hypnotized into a conviction that pain is pleasure, that disease is health, that wounds have healed, the conditions will at once become far more favorable for recovery than would be possible under normal circumstances of mental or physical suffering. And if the hypnotic state can be maintained during a somewhat protracted period—as seems not altogether improbable—the recuperative powers of nature will have a fair chance to repair damages.

Dr. Hammond has instanced a gunshot wound as a crucial test for the mind-cure practitioners, and at first blush it would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seem absurd that a man with a shattered limb should be told to believe it whole. In point of fact, however, the writer hereof has seen a red-hot iron applied to the flesh of a hypnotic subject without producing the slightest evidence of sensation. When, however, the trance was broken, nerves resumed their functions and the man acted as any one does who has recently burned his hand. Possibly if the hot iron had been applied before the trance the difficulty of obliterating the sense of feeling would have been increased, but it is not altogether incredible that even under such conditions the mind may be diverted and local insensibility induced.

Here then is an array of facts which no one who has given the matter attention will venture to deny. The senses act in obedience to the imagination under certain partly understood conditions. They compel individuals to see, hear and feel in a manner wholly at variance with fact. As a result, well authenticated ghost stories are as old as history ; manifestations and materializations are of equally respectable antiquity, and cures by "bread-pill," or "mind" or "faith," are of alleged frequent occurrence. While our brains are capable of dreaming dreams when asleep, it behooves us to be careful about denying that we can dream with our eyes open. If, as M. de la Tourette assures us, with the approval of Professor Charcot, that hypnotics may walk about seemingly in a sane condition and commit crimes without responsibility, it behooves us to be just a little prudent about asserting that every one must see the same things that we see, and in just the same way.

If the foregoing deductions are correct, disbelievers in spiritualism have been, and are, gravely at fault when they assert that all so-called "manifestations" are frauds. Delusions they may be, but not always in the sense usually understood. It would be wiser for them and scientists in general if they would proceed on the assumption that a very considerable proportion of the alleged phenomena are due to a species of hypnotism on the part of the observer. When the characteristics of this not uncommon mental freak are better understood, possibly some good may result for the world at large ; but in the meantime there is no possible use in telling people that they have not seen what they honestly believe they have seen.

CHARLES LEDYARD NORTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

NEGLECTED CHILDREN.

If I were asked to name one product of vice and crime, which soonest would touch the hearts of all good people, I would say, "a neglected child." There is something in the helplessness of childhood which appeals to every human heart. In childhood there is something angelic which every soul grieves to see soiled and bedevilled by association with vice and crime, or cradled, suckled, and bred up amid scenes of guilt, intemperance, and profligacy. Christians and heathen, Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics feel alike the spell and pathos of childhood. Nature and Religion recognize the sadness of child suffering.

In the poorer sections of all our great cities, neglected children are plenteously bred. They are orphans, bastards, or deserted children, or the offspring of depraved and intemperate parents. Poverty, profligacy, intemperance, and the promiscuous herding together of both sexes in the vile localities of the cities are responsible for them. They are forever coming on. They are propagated so profusely that a Malthus preaching civilization might regard it fortunate that the places of infant nurture are also the haunts of the deadliest infantile diseases. They subsist on charity, by pickings and stealings, and on the refuse of the markets and restaurants. They find shelter as best they may.

In New York (and I believe in other of our large cities) there is a society organized for the prevention of cruelty to children. Great is the good work which they have done. Most marvelous is the misery which they have exposed. To read their reports without shuddering at the immensity of the cruelty to which children are subjected, is impossible; but it is yet more sad to see some of these neglected children themselves, just when they are rescued, with faces so stamped already with the devil marks of vice and crime that it is scarcely possible to believe that it was of such as they, that Christ said: "*Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that in Heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in Heaven.*"

Apart from all religious and sentimental aspects there is another view which must be taken. Neglected children are to be feared, not because of their childish attempts at evil, but rather because the child, being father to the man, has a potentiality for a vast amount of mischief, when the seeds of his early training bear fruit in the maturity of manhood. While foreign nations have dealt with neglected children as if they were merely so many stray animals, we must regard them in the higher aspect of embryo citizens and law makers who will become possessed of powers which jails cannot control and police courts cannot cope with.

The foreign theory is that children are the property of their parents, to be utilized as the latter see fit—to be exhibited to make money, even though their education be neglected, their morals impaired, and life shortened. The American theory is, that it is rather the duty of the parents to support the child than for children to support their parents. It insists that the child should be taught to read and write and be fitted by education to become a reputable American citizen; that no child should toil in the factory, nor beg upon the street; that no occupation which stunts the body or contaminates the character should be followed. The two theories have been recently illustrated by the case of Josef Hofmann, the musical prodigy.

Neglected children are far more apt to be the product of cities than of the country; yet their redemption is one of those necessities which the whole nation is interested in enforcing. It is from them that the criminal class is most largely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reinforced. The precocity of childhood is proverbial. The poor little neglected wretches are guilty of innumerable petty pilferings to stave off the pangs of hunger. They grow dangerous faster than they grow in years, for poverty sharpens the wits and an empty stomach knows no conscience.

There is hardly a crime on the statute books of which children between the ages of six and fourteen have not been accused in the criminal courts of the city of New York.

No nation, much less the United States, can afford to permit its cities to breed such reinforcements to the criminal classes; and so it becomes the business of the whole nation to aid and sustain those brave and generous souls who are striving to redeem neglected children—even though such efforts be restricted by the geographical limits of a municipality.

ARTHUR DUDLEY VINTON.

II.

PHILOLOGICAL CURIOSITIES.

MR. SAMUEL L. CLEMENS ("Mark Twain"), in his mosaic-like work, "Life on the Mississippi," relates how in New Orleans the word *lagniappe* is used, and states the singular fact that its use is restricted to that one city, and is not heard or understood elsewhere. This reminded me that in Savannah, Georgia, where my boyhood was passed, there is a word whose habitat is limited to that one town, and, perhaps, its immediate vicinity. I never heard it anywhere else, though I lived for several years in the interior of that State. The word is *brottus*. I spell it as it is pronounced, for I never heard it spelled, or saw it in print or writing. Its use is confined almost exclusively to children and negroes. In this respect, as well as its meaning, it resembles *lagniappe*. It means a little something over or in excess of a given quantity, and partakes of the nature of a gratuity. I can best illustrate its exact definition by explaining in what circumstances it is used. If a child or a negro, either upon their own account, or in the performance of an errand for parents or employers, makes a purchase at a grocery or other store, the child or negro will usually ask, "What are you going to give me for *brottus ?*" or, "Aren't you going to give me something for *brottus ?*" This is a request for a small present or good-will offering, in return for the purchaser's patronage. The shop-keeper seldom refuses to honor this draft upon his generosity, but adds to the commodity purchased a little more of the same, or perhaps some other small article of trifling value. In the case of children, this little gift usually takes the form of a bit of candy, or a "specked" apple or orange. Of course, a request for *brottus* is beneath the dignity of the adult white person; hence its use only by children and negroes.

The origin of this word is entirely unknown to me. I suppose that like *buccra* (white person), or *goober* (peanut, or "ground nut," as it is commonly called at the South), it belongs to some African dialect, imported with slaves from the Dark Continent.

E. M. DAY.

III.

HYPNOTISM IN POLITICS.

FREE traders are endeavoring to repeat on the sphere of social science a recent wonderful experiment successfully performed by medical experts in Paris. It is recorded that a paralytic patient was placed by the side of a hypnotized subject, and that the paralysis was successfully transferred from the patient to the subject. The physicians who performed this marvelous experiment were bound, of course, to repeat the operation to relieve the hypnotized subject from the disease that he had scientifically acquired. American free traders are now trying to hypnotize America. England is suffering from a slight shock of commercial paralysis, and seeks, by free trade, to relieve herself at our expen e. Undoubtedly her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"science" would be fully able to effect the transfer of her paralysis to our America. By it, *she* would be restored to perfect health. But before we submit to the free trade hypnotistic experiment, would it not be prudent to exact securities for the retransfer of the paralysis? John Bull never fails to look out for his own interests and it is quite probable that as soon as he felt that his paralysis had left him, he would take good care that the experiment should be stopped before the disease could be returned to him. The interests of science might suffer by this selfishness; but business before science is his practice.

JOHN BALL, JR.

IV.

THEATRICAL CAPUAS.

THE ordinary man is not given to reflection. As he witnesses some splendid performance at a well-appointed city theatre, he little reflects that the actor whose delineations of character surprise him into admiration, has gained the power of forcing tears or smiles from an audience, not in Capua, but in Sparta. There is no royal road to learning—so they say; but the educational paths which royalty travels are usually smoothed and graded by well-trained gardeners; and as the ways by which royalty saunters its life-passage through the world are usually rendered pleasant and easy by forethought and skillful care, so the experience which a theatrical novice must gain may be written by heredity or social influence upon the finger-posts marking the paths which lead to the temple of fame.

The way which every man treads for himself over the trackless plain of life is marked by stumbling-blocks and pitfalls. As in nature, so in human experience, those paths are rugged which lead the traveler over boulders and along precipices upward to the mountain peak whence he can spy the whole world beneath him. And, no doubt, if we could read the workings of the human heart, we would learn that the difficulties of the ascent lend an additional pleasure to the attainment of the height, and that those achievements are most highly prized which are gained by days of hard physical exertion or nights of exhausting thought. Nothing can be really worse for the embryo actor than a leap at once into public favor. The Spartan boy never knew the luxury of the physical health he enjoyed until he felt the fox gnawing at his vitals.

The actor cannot know the joy of fame if he gain not reputation by his own struggles. Anticipation is apt to be so much more full of pleasure than attainment that success is robbed of half its joy if it come too quickly. Men value life the more after they have surmounted the realities of life. It is a childhood in Sparta which makes the pleasures of Capua so enervating to the stranger sojourning in Capua. Those actors whom good fortune or family influence has placed at once upon the metropolitan stage have seldom the theatrical power which characterizes those who served their novitiate as barnstormers in the country. The greatest actors have always been the ones who, when acquiring the rudiments of their education have delineated human passion amid bare and makeshift surroundings—who, from the circumstances in which they were placed, have been forced to influence their audience by an exact simulation of human hopes and fears, and joys and sorrows, without the adventitious aid of elaborate stage-setting. Our great city theatres are as enervating to real theatrical talent as the city of Capua was to the army of Hannibal. The Spartan discipline of country barnstorming trains the actor to become the metropolitan star, capable of "holding the mirror up to nature"—capable of evoking the sympathy and applause of his audience, independently of the skill of the scene-painter and stage carpenter.

MARGARET COGHLEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

V.

WHO ARE THE CULPRITS?

SOCIALISTS delight in denouncing the rich or "privileged classes," as the wealthier citizens of the Republic are sometimes most incorrectly styled—the "capitalistic class," to use their favorite phrase—as the authors and supporters of the laws that favor corporations to the prejudice of the masses of the people. American workingmen will never effect any legislative reform until they have the moral courage to see and to confess that for whatever social evils legislation entails they alone or at least they chiefly are responsible. There is not a single election precinct in the United States in which the workingmen do not constitute an overwhelming majority of the popular vote. *They* choose the lawmakers. They invest the various executive officers with the power of the State and Nation. If these men, as a class, therefore, prove unworthy of their trust, it is the workingmen who should be held accountable for it. To denounce any class of men for perverting the laws to their personal advantage is alike idle and illogical; classes always have and corporations always will seek to so construe the laws as to advance their selfish interests, and no wise legislator can innocently ignore this fact. It is probably impossible—as Napoleon discovered—to make laws so simple and clear that a member of a learned profession can never pervert their intent, but it certainly is quite within the power of laws to prevent the "exploitation" of the masses by the classes to an extent that would be seriously felt. But to secure impartial legislation, it is absolutely indispensable that legislators should be chosen not in view of party expediency, but to secure agents too intelligent to be deceived and too honest to be approached by the givers of bribes. It is a notorious fact that the most corrupt legislators are chosen from districts where the workingmen are strongest. Workingmen sow tares in the ballot-box, and expect to reap wheat in the legislative hall. Of course they are always disappointed and always will be disappointed until they learn that men never gather grapes from thistles—that in the political as well as in the rural fields men reap as they sow.

Honest voting for honest candidates—this is the alpha and omega of reform. Until the workingmen realize this truth they will be cheated just as often as they vote. "Third parties" or "a single tax" will bring them no nearer to equal rights nor hasten the advent by a single hour of the millennium that they seek to inaugurate. Union of labor also is not sufficient until it results in the election of integrity and capacity. If the present representatives of workingmen in the State and National legislatures are neither honest nor efficient, let the workingmen remember that they themselves are the culprits.

HENRY MELROSE.

VI.

PERSONALITY OF TEACHERS.

ETERNAL vigilance is the price of liberty. This is an old saying, but every now and then it receives a new force, as the agencies of our liberties become afflicted with dry-rot, or are attacked by ill-wishers to our material prosperity. The public school, rather than the press, has become the palladium of our liberties. But the educational system of the United States is threatened now by a fungous growth which, sooner or later, attaches itself to every human agency of progress. Red tape has wound itself so closely about the public school system, that teachers and pupils alike suffer from the ill effects of constriction. Under its baneful influence teachers have become automatons, capable of imparting only cut-and-dried infor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mation. It is a rare thing now to find in the public schools a living teacher. The old race of pedagogues, who came directly into contact with the minds of children, and fashioned not only the mental powers, but also the characters of their pupils, is dying out. In the city of New York, for example, the supply of teachers by the regulations of the public school commissioners is practically limited to the young and inexperienced girls who swarm out of the Normal College. These "girl graduates" have been brought up in the New York public schools, and are acquainted with no methods save those which have prevailed in these schools during their attendance. "They go into the schools with the idea that they have a right to the empty places, and their crude and machine-like work, modeled solely on what they have seen, serves only to intensify the constantly accumulating evil tendencies of our schools." And if an experienced and wise teacher comes from some town outside the city, his every movement is cramped and fettered by some one of the petty regulations of the Board of Education.

Under the regulations of our School Commissioners, the reputation of the teacher depends entirely upon the number of good marks which the scholars attain upon examination. The physical well-being of the class, the moral character and strength of intellect which the teacher has inculcated, count for nothing. The teacher who has succeeded in embedding on the tongue-tips of his pupils a certain set of cut-and-dried facts and figures, is the teacher who is considered most successful. There is no free play in teaching. There is no opportunity given to a teacher to study the capabilities or characters of pupils. A certain number of facts, dates and cut-and-dried information must be crammed into the heads of the pupils, or the teacher loses his place.

This is all wrong. There must be less centralization and more individuality in the pedagogic system. The present system of examinations must be entirely done away with. There must be a change, and a radical change. There must be an increase in the personality of the teacher, and a decrease in the red-tapeism of the Board of Education.

BRISCOE E. MAN.

VII.

FLEXIBLE MAJORITIES ONCE MORE.

IN Col. Norton's comments, in the May REVIEW, on my article in the April REVIEW, some points are well taken, but others seem more like the genial assurances of an optimist than the cold conclusions of a statistician. The theory that in great crises the people recognize the importance of the issues at stake, and vote overwhelmingly for the right, is not borne out by the figures. The most momentous question that we have ever decided by a popular election came up in 1864, when the re-nomination of President Lincoln put to the test the determination to continue the war to a successful issue. Yet Mr. Lincoln was re-elected by a majority of only ten per cent. in the popular vote; a change of one ballot in twenty would have given his opponent a majority, and would probably have established the Confederacy. On his first election Mr. Lincoln had only a plurality. If patriotic Democrats had been as willing to vote for liberty and the preservation of the Union in 1860 as they were to fight for it in 1861, the Secessionists would perhaps not have felt encouraged to carry their great conspiracy into execution. In speaking of "make-weight parties," I did not refer to the Mugwumps, for they are not a party; but in this connection it may be as well to examine the oft-repeated assertion that the Free-soilers of 1844–48 and the Republicans of 1854–56 were the Mugwumps of their day. If the Free-soilers in 1844 had declared that James K. Polk was better than his party, was in fact an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-slavery man, and had voted for him, reviling Henry Clay professedly because he favored slavery, but in reality because he was a protectionist, then the Free-soilers would have been the Mugwumps of their day. And if, after President Polk had secured Texas as slave territory, and thrown away half of Oregon because it would have increased our free territory, they had still declared him a reasonably good anti-slavery man, and demanded his re-election, they would have been the very perfection of Mugwumps. But instead of this they simply nominated and voted for James G. Birney, an abolitionist who had proved his sincerity by manumitting his slaves. A similar explanation would also show that the Republicans of 1854–56 do not deserve to be stigmatized as the Mugwumps of their day. What might be done if voters were properly enlightened may be inferred from the working of the jury system. It is only now and then that a jury fails to find a unanimous verdict, and in case of disagreement it is seldom six to six or seven to five. This is simply because the jurymen hear all the evidence and arguments on both sides, and vote honestly. But the great popular jury of ten million voters will not do this, and so is permanently divided into nearly equal sections.

ROSSITER JOHNSON.

VIII.

POLITICAL MARIONETTES.

IN a very forcible and thoughtful article in the April number of THE REVIEW, Mr. Rossiter Johnson says: "If, with all our colleges, all our common schools, all our newspapers, all our periodicals, all our pulpits, all the free discussion that is carried on throughout the land, never more than a trifle over half of the voters can find out what is the wise and honest course to be pursued, then of what use are all these educational institutions and processes?" And elsewhere in his article he remarks: "In this day of newspapers we ought to be able to look to journalism for the * * enlightenment of ballot-casters."

Mr. Johnson falls into the error which influences so many other good men, namely, the belief or presumption that our political teachers are capable of imparting correct instruction and delivering unbiassed judgment. Nothing is further from the truth. Newspapers, common schools, colleges, and pulpits, are all marionettes, obeying the motions of some unseen wire-puller.

Did you ever see a marionette performance? If you have seen a good, first-class one, you must have been struck with the almost human intelligence which the actors displayed. Reason told you that they were only wooden figures, dressed up, and obeying the manipulations of unseen persons operating from above the "flies." Marionettes are not indigenous to this country, so it is permissible for us to flatter ourselves that the intelligence which they display is not representative of American ability.

If you have not seen a marionette performance, then, for your benefit, let me say that marionettes are wooden figures, to whose arms and legs strings are attached, and each marionette moves—indeed lives, moves, and has its being—in the manipulations of the human being at the other end of the strings. The simulated life thus imparted to these insensate blocks of wood is wonderfully realistic, and the performance of the marionette is often capable of giving greater pleasure than would follow a similar performance by the manipulator behind the scenes.

There are such things as political bosses, and nowadays it is one of the principal duties of a political boss to sit in the headquarters of his party and pull the strings which political influence has previously attached to the arms and legs of teachers, editors, and orators. In the marionette performance the words of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

play are spoken by persons hidden in the "wings;" so, in the political performance, the noble sentiments and political doctrines of public teachers and preachers are put into their mouths by the boss or his agents. The teacher, editor, and preacher are merely the creatures of the political boss. What he directs them to teach or say, that the public hear.

The public teacher who, either from the intensity of his convictions or the purity of his character, wishes to speak his mind to the people, is not permitted by the party managers to address the audiences which assemble at party gatherings. He is driven to some independent public meeting. If he be rich, he can hire a hall and talk to those people who, in one way or another, he has induced to be present; if he be poor, his only chance is to find a footing upon the platforms of the Labor party, the Temperance party, or the Anti-Povertyites. The regular political machines have no use for him, nor for any other man who thinks independently of the political bosses. They permit no man to speak at the public meetings which they control who is not a marionette, and whose words and actions are not directed by themselves.

A. O. HUNTINGTON.

IX.

INTELLIGENCE OF MONKEYS.

RECENTLY there have appeared in THE REVIEW several articles treating of the intelligence and reasoning power of animals. I have seen these articles copied in many journals throughout the country—a fact which shows how popular they have proved—and, therefore, I am emboldened to add to the instances of animal intelligence already mentioned in THE REVIEW another instance which has not been previously mentioned, probably because it has only very recently become generally known in this country. At a certain theatre in the city of New York a troupe of trained monkeys is performing in so-called theatrical representations—not theatrical representations of a high degree, but rather a performance which reminds one irresistibly of the dramatic performances which certain tribes in the interior of Africa are reported to produce for the entertainment of explorers.

No one can witness the performance of these monkeys at the Star Theatre without being at once struck with the vast difference that exists between every act of the monkey tribe and every act of the human player. No matter how ignorant and absurd the man may be upon the stage he displays at least a certain power to originate, while the monkey convinces the most obtuse spectator that it is acting by rote. Yet no training could produce such results as these monkeys produce, if in the monkey mind there did not exist some latent germ of mental development. There are few people who have not seen, at some time or other in their lives, performances by trained dogs, horses or elephants; but between such performances and the acting of the monkeys a difference is easily perceptible. In the monkey there is at least a glimmer of the light of reason, while in the other animals we can see nothing but the darkness of mental obscurity. The difference is not great, but the fact of its existence is perceptible. As the monkey is supposed to approach nearer to man, so we may note an improvement over the other animals. Some of the gestures, and I may even say some of the facial expressions of the monkeys, are wondrously human. We know that the gestures have been taught to these animals by years of careful training, but it is difficult to realize that the facial expression is not spontaneous. Those persons who are interested in the possibilities of animal intelligence may find profit and pleasure in the study of these monkey actors.

J. S. SCHNEIDER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

I.

INVESTING MONEY.

THE author of this brief treatise* withholds his name lest he should incur the suspicion of endeavoring to advertise his business. The papers, therefore, are to be judged by their intrinsic merits; but it is presumable that the experiences of any intelligent person engaged in the work of dealing in securities must have a certain practical value. The subject is interesting to an increasingly wide circle, for in spite of all that is said and written about the hardness of the times, there are additions every year to the great army of investors. This book has nothing to do with the subject of "making" money. It gives some sound information and sensible advice as to the different kinds of American securities, and the means of distinguishing between the good, the bad, and the indifferent. The author alleges that the making of shares and bonds, the latter represented to be amply secured by mortgage liens, has been carried to criminal excess, and he gives an instance in proof, where a railroad, on the strength of forty-eight miles of constructed road, costing $10,000 per mile, succeeded in negotiating $5,000,000 of paper, after which it went into the hands of a receiver, who issued a considerable amount in certificates for repairs, and finally the road was sold for $40,000, payable in said certificates, which had been purchased at a large discount. He avers that "there never was a time when it was so easy to invest money—and to lose it." Before investing, a very careful scrutiny should be made as to the actual, not alleged, values on which the so-called securities are based, and even as to the wording of the securities themselves. "In many cases the buyers of bonds and other securities learn when it is too late that their purchases, owing to some obscure and apparently innocent passage that had been overlooked or disregarded, are very different from what they thought they were getting." Again: "Unless you are previously familiar with the document in all its parts, don't fail to read it before you buy. Read it all, the little type as well as the big type, the indorsements, the coupons, and all. Don't take somebody else's word for it. Examine the seal, the signatures, and even the embellishments."

From the above extracts the reader may judge for himself of the value of this little manual. The author deals particularly with such matters as Governments, State bonds, municipals, railroad mortgages and shares, farm mortgages, ranch securities, water-works loans, street railway bonds, mining securities, bridge bonds, and other kinds of investments. He incidentally mentions the interesting

*"The Art of Investing." By a New York Broker. D. Appleton & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact or estimate that the various civilized nations on the globe owe an equivalent to an average of $720 on every square mile of their territory, or $23 per capita, on all their subjects, absorbing no less than twenty-seven thousand millions of securities ($27,000,000,000) on which they are paying interest.

The chapter on speculation is worth attentive reading by all who feel drawn towards Wall street, particularly with other people's money. The author pictures the New York Stock Exchange—despite its eminent respectability—as an enormous devil-fish with a hundred thousand arms reaching into all parts of the country, and all equipped with suckers more or less powerful, and busy, every one of them, in extracting nourishment for the monster to which it belongs. And he gives facts and arguments to prove this. This is pretty good from a New York broker: "When the cleverest operators, the trained *habitués* of the street, so often make shipwreck, what hope is there for the inexperienced?" "The popular idea," he says, "is that the Exchange has upon its list, to be dealt in, all or nearly all prominent stocks and bonds of acknowledged value, impartially selected and solely because of their merits. There could be no greater misconception." And then he mentions several unexceptionable securities which one never sees listed. On the other hand the Exchange parades a column of "tatterdemalions." Theoretically the Exchange should be unobjectionable, but practically it is an immense gambling establishment, and is the last place to go to for reliable information about any stock bought or sold in its precincts. In this terrible arraignment the author also includes the Chicago Board of Trade and the Pittsburg Petroleum Board.

The speculator will not find much to encourage or guide him in these pages, which are intended, not for his benefit, but for the assistance of those who buy for investment, and wish above all things absolute security for their money. To all such it is sure to prove a very interesting and valuable book, deserving of careful reading. There is an appendix to the book containing a list of investment securities.

II.

INTERNATIONAL LAW.

AMONG the many excellent books of D. Appleton & Co.'s International Scientific Series, Prof. Leone Levi's treatise on International Law* deserves exceedingly favorable mention as the latest and best attempt to give a practical tone to the theories and discussions upon this subject. It embodies within a small compass a great multitude and variety of very interesting facts, including a brief historical review of the progress of international relations, and the present political condition of the various States which constitute the existing family of nations. The materials for an International Code are gathered from established principles recognized and usually observed among civilized people, and also from treaties and conventions; and the author justly surmises that these may be of practical use in facilitating a resort to arbitration in cases of dispute between nations. Statesmen and jurists will find valuable data in this volume, covering as it does the entire field of international relations, including such matters as extradition, patent laws, joint stock companies, domicile and marriage, ambassadors, diplomatic agents and consuls, commerce and navigation—the whole being compactly and concisely put together, so as to convey the pith and substance of the matter without learned verbosity. We predict that this little hand-book will be for many years to come an authoritative work of reference on the important subject of

* "International Law." With Materials for a Code. By Leone Levi, F.S.A. D. Appleton & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which it treats. Among other useful features it gives a list of the principal works published upon international law during the past three or four hundred years.

III.

SOME EDUCATIONAL WORKS.

THE aims and methods of the Manual Training School are intelligently set forth in a new work on this subject,* which consists, in part, of addresses delivered by the author, Dr. C. M. Woodward, of the St. Louis Training School, to various educational gatherings during the last twelve years at Saratoga, St. Louis and Chicago. Repetitions must, therefore, be expected. The most valuable portion of the book is the elaborate and practical outline of a three years' course in an ideal school, which is presented in as many chapters, covering over one hundred pages. Admirable illustrations of drawings in all departments, estimates of expense, and clear descriptions of methods of shop-work, accompanied by specimens of actual lessons in different branches, contribute to the usefulness of these chapters, which will commend themselves as being intensely practical to the industrial educator, or to any who wish exact information on this subject. No volume of the sort, so far as we know, has been published in this country. A systematic arrangement of the interesting matter contained in the addresses, would add greatly to its availability to many whose ideas of industrial education are necessarily indefinite. As to the results of manual training, the statements of individual graduates who have left a given institution within the past four years can hardly be accepted as authoritative estimates of what the system is worth. They are of necessity prejudiced and immature judgments, and we must wait for the years to discover what the introduction of shop-work and domestic economy into the curriculum of the schools can accomplish for the boys and girls of America.

A briefer study of the same subject,† by Robert Seidel, of Switzerland, has already been translated into French and Italian, and now appears in English dress through the good offices of one of its American admirers.

The work had its origin in a reply made by Herr Seidel to certain objections which were raised against industrial instruction in the Synod of the Canton of Zurich, where the question was discussed a few years ago in this form: "Is industrial instruction pedagogically necessary, superfluous, or is it actually injurious?" An able discussion of the inner relation between industrial education and the social question is followed by the careful consideration of the numerous objections proposed by its opponents, which may be studied to advantage by educators on this side of the water.

Still another work on pedagogy‡ has no nominal connection with industrial education, but in reality it breathes the same spirit of life and progress. "Chips," says the author, "are useful for kindling fire," and these scraps of advice, suggestions of methods, and deductions from the practical experience of a teacher and supervisor ought to enkindle enthusiasm in any earnest teacher, superintendent, or supervisor who reads them. There is nothing approaching pedantry. The

* "The Manual Training School, comprising a full Statement of its Aims, Methods and Results, with figured drawings of Shop Exercises in Woods and Metals." By C. M. Woodward, Director of the Manual Training School at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. D. C. Heath & Co.

† "Industrial Instruction: a Pedagogic and Social Necessity Together with a Critique upon Objections Advanced." By Robert Seidel. Translated by Margaret K. Smith. D. C. Heath & Co.

‡ "Chips from a Teacher's Workshop." By L. R. Klemm, Ph. D. Lee & Shepard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

style is clear and conversational rather than didactic, and the topics include a wide range of thought. The hints on discipline, and on the teaching of arithmetic, language, and history are of more than ordinary value.

IV.

MR. CABLE'S "BONAVENTURE."

IF one could imagine Longfellow writing the history of the descendants of Benedict Bellefontaine and Basil the blacksmith, in the forests of Beau Bassin, his fancy could picture nothing more delightfully real and in consonance with all that the poet tells us of the simple Acadian peasants than Mr. Cable's "Bonaventure."* The charm of the pastoral life of these unlearned, unsuspicious people in their rude homes far away from the stir of modern life is as novel as it is indescribable.

Of all the interesting portraits, none equals in finish and delicacy that of Bonaventure, especially with Sidonie by his side. The gentle, artless boy, the born lover, whose big blue eyes fill with tears at each of the numerous Gradnegro weddings; because, by some oversight, he and the little Zoséphine are still unwed, is the sorrowful hero of "Caranero'," the first story. His rejected love sends him to the good curé who teaches him from his few books all the learning at his command. In "Grande Pointe," however, the author paints his finest touches, and Bonaventure now appears as the poor enthusiastic lover of his kind who seeks out the distant hamlet hitherto untouched in the swift circling round of busy life, and in sweet and gentle fashion teaches marvelous English to the wondering, half doubting "'Cajuns." The plot, style and poetry of the pastoral is most finely wrought out here. In "Au Large" the city streets furnish an occasional background, but out at "Grande Pointe," the home of the birds and the bees and their equally happy human neighbors, there is nothing to intercept one's vision. Here "all nature is in glad gay earnest. Corn in blossom and rustling in the warm breeze; blackberries ripe; morning-glories underfoot, the trumpet-flower flaring from its dense green vine high above on the naked, girdled tree; the cotton-plant blooming white, yellow and red in the field beneath, honey a-making in the hives and hollow trees, butterflies and bees lingering in the fields at sunset, the moth venturing forth at the first sign of dew, and Sidonie,—a wild rose tree."

Because the central figures in Grande Pointe are so unique, those of "Au Large," who resemble the men and women we have known, lose something by contrast. But the story of the pitiful, outlawed homicide of Lake Cataouaché, struggling for his life with threatening flood and deadly reptiles, is one of the strongest descriptions in the book. It is safe to say that Mr. Cable has never produced anything so delightful and so artistic as "Bonaventure," and, having entered and explored this fascinating Acadian region so thoroughly, we do not see how he will be able to surpass so pleasant and popular a story.

V.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THERE have been many histories of the United States written within the few last years. But no writer has succeeded better than Mr. Childs in condensing into the short space of 260 pages the various historical facts which every one should know. In the little book† which he has sent into the world through the press of

* "Bonaventure: A Prose Pastoral of Acadian Louisiana." By George W. Cable. Charles Scribner's Sons.

† "A History of the United States in Chronological Order, A. D. 1492 to 1888." By Emory E. Childs. J. S. Ogilvie & Co., New York.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

J. S. Ogilvie & Co., he has managed to include all of the important geographical discoveries, political and military events, and to mention the principal manufactures as they were introduced, and the beginning and development of such other factors of industrial development as railroads, canals and telegraphs, and to record the principal inventions and chemical, mechanical and scientific discoveries. The arrangement which he adopts is the chronological; but though he follows it closely, he does not adhere to it slavishly; for example, under the division devoted to the year 1825 he digresses sufficiently to narrate some of the past services which Lafayette rendered to this country—that year being the date when Lafayette revisited the United States. So many events and circumstances have claimed the historian's notice, that many of them are of necessity often condensed into mere mention. But Mr. Childs has shown remarkable judgment in what he has condensed and what elaborated. The book will prove of inestimable value to pupils and teachers in schools, and its low price brings it within the reach of every body.

The Woman's Temperance Publishing Association sends out a small but solid little volume,* designed for the help of all boys who wish to attain a true and noble manhood. It touches all the important topics relating to the subject in a somewhat sombre and old-fashioned manner, but with the power of an earnest purpose, and is such a book as every thoughtful mother would wish her boy to read.

In scope and arrangement Dr. Von Reber's "History of Mediæval Art"† is broad and thorough. A glance at the very elaborate table of contents will show the method which the author has followed. Beginning with the early Christian and Byzantine architecture, painting and sculpture, he traces the influence of the new ideals through the Greek and Roman empires; points out their influence upon the art of the Indian and Eastern Asiatic races, and their development into the more recent style of Mohammedanism. He divides mediæval art into epochs; and under these epochs places groups corresponding to the separate nationalities. The result is a history of artistic evolution simple and natural in arrangement and logical in sequence. The book is profusely illustrated by more than four hundred engravings and has indices to artists' names and to places. It is a book which both the architect and the general reader may study with pleasure and profit.

This little book‡ which Dr. Colton has compiled should be in the library of every reader of Shakespeare. Here, within a space of less than two hundred pages, we have a most complete exposition of Shakespeare's knowledge of the Bible and his indebtedness to the Book of Books for some of his rarest jewels of thought and expression. Others than Dr. Colton have written upon this subject (for no one conversant with the Bible can read Shakespeare without finding constant allusion to the Scriptures and to Scriptural truth), but no one hitherto has succeeded in condensing, as Dr. Colton has condensed, the religious principles and sentiments of the wonderful plays into so small, yet so complete a compass. Excepting the Concordance by Mrs. O'Connor, noticed in the NORTH AMERICAN RE-

*"Boys and other Boys." By Lucy A. Scott. Woman's Temperance Publishing Association, Chicago.

†"History of Mediæval Art." By Dr. Franz von Reber. Translated by Joseph Thacher Clarke. Harper & Bros.

‡"Shakespeare and the Bible; Parallel Passages, and the Religious Sentiments of Shakespeare." By G. Q. Colton, with an introduction by Rev. Robert Collyer. Knox & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIEW for December last, there has been published during the past twelvemonth no book of greater value to the Shakespearian student and reader than this little book of Dr. Colton.

A pleasant book to stow away for a traveling satchel is the translation of a clean little French story* which originally appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, under the title of "La Neuvaine de Colette." The heroine is a bright, pretty French girl of an enterprising disposition, whose solitary, uneventful life in a ruined chateau of the time of Louis XIII., under the strict espionage of a grim old aunt, becomes unbearable. By the advice of an ancient dame Colette observes a *neuvaine* ("nine days' prayer") before a statuette of St. Joseph, whom she implores to send her a liberator. At the midnight hour of the ninth day, no brave knight having appeared, in a fit of rage and disappointment she throws the unlucky image crashing through the window, and seriously wounds the young Count de Civreuse, who, by a strange chance, has strayed from his course and has wandered that way. Of course the Count is taken into the chateau, and, during his protracted convalescence, a piquant courtship takes place, with a result which the reader has anticipated from the first, but which he has several times abandoned. The style and the story are pure and pleasing, and will attract lovers of the Lorna Doone class of fiction, which is, indeed, the best class.

The J. B. Lippincott Co. publish a handsome illustrated edition for the drawing-room of Goldsmith's "Deserted Village." The etchings, six in number, are by M. M. Taylor. For the little folk this house also issue in plain boards, very tastily decorated and fully illustrated, Ida Waugh's "Alphabet Book," the verses by Amy E. Blanchard.

The modern traveler who would present a successful account of his wanderings wisely selects a special field for his pen, and does not attempt to incorporate in a single volume the results of his observations in all departments of art, science, industry or political economy. Mr. Curtis Guild's sketchy résumé† at once claims attention by reason of its limited theme. The hurried reader concludes that he has time to hear what may be said of the Britons and the Russians, whereas if the title were extended to Travels in England and on the Continent, comparatively few would approach it. The author's practical fancy finds food for discussion in many of the minor observances of foreign life, though not entirely excluding the esthetic. The relative merits of English and American hotels, or, more properly, the hotels of London and New York, are discussed in the first fifty pages, and an astonishing amount of information, not at all flattering to the English landlord, is given. There are three interesting chapters descriptive of English towns and abbeys, and the remainder of the work is devoted to pleasant, chatty descriptions of Russian cities, buildings, and customs. The style of the "special" newspaper correspondent is plainly visible, and the reader finds many literary faults to excuse; but the fresh, practical topics, such as every traveler likes to know about in advance, hold his interest, and he concludes that the editor of *The Boston Commercial Bulletin* is a live man and an entertaining one, if he is not always a polished writer.

* "The Story of Colette." From the original, "La Neuvaine de Colette." The Gainesborough Series. D. Appleton & Co.

† "Britons and Muscovites; or, Traits of Two Empires." By Curtis Guild, Editor of *The Boston Commercial Bulletin*. Lee & Shepard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED